Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy

Augustine

On the Trinity

Edited by
Gareth B. Matthews

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE
HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

AUGUSTINE

On the Trinity
Books 8–15

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

The main objective of Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy is to expand the range, variety and quality of texts in the history of philosophy which are available in English. The series includes texts by familiar names (such as Descartes and Kant) and also by less well-known authors. Wherever possible, texts are published in complete and unabridged form, and translations are specially commissioned for the series. Each volume contains a critical introduction together with a guide to further reading and any necessary glossaries and textual apparatus. The volumes are designed for student use at undergraduate and postgraduate level and will be of interest not only to students of philosophy, but also to a wider audience of readers in the history of science, the history of theology and the history of ideas.

For a list of titles published in the series, please see end of book.

AUGUSTINE

On the Trinity
Books 8–15

EDITED BY

GARETH B. MATTHEWS
University of Massachussetts, Amherst

TRANSLATED BY

STEPHEN McKENNA

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS (VIRTUAL PUBLISHING)
FOR AND ON BEHALF OF THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 IRP
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

http://www.cambridge.org

First published in printed format 2002

A catalogue record for the original printed book is available
from the British Library and from the Library of Congress
Original ISBN 0 521 79231 2 hardback
Original ISBN 0 521 79665 2 paperback

ISBN 0 511 02028 7 virtual (netLibrary Edition)

For Scott

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Contents

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Introduction

Although unknown to many Western philosophers today, Augustine's *De Trinitate* is a strikingly original and highly important philosophical treatise. As a whole, the work is an account of the perplexing Christian doctrine that God is both three and one. But, quite surprisingly, the last half is also a treatise on the philosophy of mind; it is, in fact, the first such treatise on mind in the modern sense of "mind." How Augustine came to write a theological work on the Divine Trinity which is also a treatise on the human mind is an interesting story in itself.

Augustine begins his work by trying to establish the biblical credentials of the Doctrine of the Trinity. Thus Books 1 through 4 are primarily an exercise in biblical exegesis aimed at showing that this doctrine is indeed to be found in the Bible. The next three books, 5 through 7, develop the metaphysical and epistemological distinctions Augustine thinks he needs to discuss the Divine Trinity. Then comes what is philosophically the most exciting part of the work, the last half. It is in that part, Books 8 through 15, that Augustine develops his remarkably original thoughts on the human mind.

To be sure, there are also other works in which Augustine develops thoughts about the mind. One of the most interesting of these, Book 10 of the *Confessions*, might easily be overlooked as a source for Augustine's philosophy of mind because the explicit topic for discussion there is *memoria*, memory. Although that book is indeed devoted to what Augustine there calls "memory," it soon becomes clear to the reader that what Augustine is thinking of in this work as *memoria* is actually very close to what we today call "mind" and what Augustine also, in his *De Trinitate* calls "mind" (*mens*).

Augustine's *Confessions* is certainly important as a precursor to *De Trinitate* 8–15, but not only because *Confessions* 10 is also, in effect, a discussion of mind; it is important because in *Confessions* 13 Augustine offers us a preview of the overall project that occupies him in *De Trinitate* 8–15 (hereafter "DT 8–15"). Here is the *Confessions* passage:

> Who can understand the omnipotent Trinity? Yet who does not speak about it, if indeed it can be spoken about? It is a rare soul who knows what he is talking about when he speaks of it. People debate and quarrel, and without peace no one sees that vision. I wish human disputants would reflect on a certain three things in their very own selves. These three things are very different from the Trinity, but I say that people could well exercise themselves and test and sense how far distant they are from it. I am talking about these three things: being, knowing, and willing. For I am and I know and I will. In that I know and will, I am. And I know myself to be and to will. And I will to be and to know. Let him who can, see in these three things how inseparable a life is: one life, one mind, and one essence, how there is, finally, an inseparable distinction, and yet a distinction. Surely this is obvious to each one himself. Let him look within himself and see and report to me. (*Confessions* 13.11.12)

The idea is a brilliant one. For a conscious human self, that self's being, knowing, and willing are so closely related to each other that, although they are distinct, they cannot be pried apart. Where there is no more knowing or willing, the conscious self simply ceases to exist. Nor is there willing apart from knowing, at least in some general way, what one wills; or, in general, knowing apart from willing to know, nor, of course, willing or knowing apart from a being that wills and knows.

Could one use the complexities of this mental three-in-oneness to illuminate the three-in-oneness of God? Augustine suggests this possibility in the *Confessions* passage above, and he undertakes to make the possibility an actuality in the last half of his great *De Trinitate*, which is the part translated here.

Augustine's idea, although certainly very imaginative, is not without biblical foundation. In the creation story, at *Genesis* 1:26, God says, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Two features of this Divine utterance are especially important to Augustine's Trinity project. One is the surprisingly plural nature of God's syntax. Augustine quite naturally

takes “let us” and “our” to indicate that it is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit who are speaking here.

The second especially significant feature of the *Genesis* passage is the idea that Adam, and later, Eve, are made in the *image* of God. The idea that the human self, and especially that part of the human self that sets human beings apart from the lower animals, namely, the mind, is an image of God, *imago Dei*, gives Augustine both the incentive and the license to find in the human mind significant similarities to God, the more the better. He can do this without having to suggest in any way that human beings might come to rival God in perfection. The idea of the human mind as an *imago Dei* also gives him the idea of admonishing his readers to burnish the Divine image within them, again, without needing to fear the sin of perfectionism. After all, an image, no matter how well it images what it is the image of, will necessarily remain derivative from its original.

Not surprisingly, by the time Augustine actually completes DT 8–15, his Trinity project has become much more complex than what is suggested in *Confessions* 13. For one thing, he thinks of many more mental or psychological triads besides being, knowing, and willing that might help illuminate the three-in-oneness of God. And there are now many, many auxiliary projects to attend to, such as saying how we know what a mind is, explaining how it is we know there are other minds and how the mind can even think of itself at all, and so on. These auxiliary projects, plus the constant need to provide biblical support for his project, lead Augustine to write fifteen substantial books just to develop fully the project he had outlined so succinctly in *Confessions* 13.

Philosophers today are likely to know that Augustine said something quite like Descartes’ famous *cogito, ergo sum*. (One of the more interesting such passages is to be found in DT 15.) However, they may not know that he anticipated Descartes’ critics by posing the Problem of Other Minds (“How do I know that there is a mind in addition to my own?”), let alone that he anticipated defenders of Descartes by proposing the Argument from Analogy for Other Minds. Yet fascinating discussions of these and all the other topics listed above await the reader of this volume.

If Descartes and his philosophy of mind were of only historical interest to philosophers today, it might still be worthwhile to call Augustine’s philosophy of mind to their attention. I am not thinking of how we might want to know who got which idea first, or who was influenced by whom,

and in what way. I am thinking of the way an earlier expression of an idea sometimes helps us understand better the later expression of that same idea.

In fact, however, Descartes' philosophy of mind is of much more than merely historical interest today. The ghost of Descartes lives on in even the most materialistic accounts of mind on offer in recent philosophy. Successfully laying the ghost of Descartes is still the standard by which even the most anti-Cartesian philosophies of mind are judged. And so for this reason, too, studying Augustine's nearly Cartesian philosophy of mind is of philosophical, as well as historical, interest today.

I have insisted that DT 8–15 is a strikingly original work. It certainly is that. But it is not totally without precedent. For one thing, there are obviously earlier attempts to interpret the Doctrine of the Trinity, which was a topic of consuming debate in the fourth century. Augustine himself refers to and quotes Hilary of Poitiers at DT 6.10.11 and at 15.3.5; he also uses Hilary's trinitarian formula elsewhere in his own work. In fact, Augustine is not even the first person to suggest analogies for interpreting the Trinity, or even the first to suggest a human triad as a help in understanding the three-in-oneness of God. Perhaps the neo-Platonist, Marius Victorinus, who seems to have been about sixty years older than Augustine and who suggests being, living, and understanding as a helpful parallel, deserves that distinction.[1] But certainly Victorinus's suggestion, however exactly it is to be understood, did not lead him to develop a philosophy of mind to support his suggestion. So the claim of originality for Augustine's Trinity project is not under serious threat.

Faith in search of understanding

Augustine begins Book 8 with a Preface that sets forth the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity. "Thus the Father is God," he writes,

> the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God; the Father is good, the Son is good, the Holy Spirit is good; and the Father is omnipotent, the Son is omnipotent, and the Holy Spirit is omnipotent; but yet there are not three gods, nor three goods, nor three omnipotents, but one God, one good, and one omnipotent, the Trinity itself. (DT 8, Preface)

[1] See Marius Victorinus, *Theological Treatises on the Trinity*, trans. M. T. Clark, The Fathers of the Church 69, Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1978, esp. p. 192.

This is the puzzling doctrine that Augustine wants to illuminate in the remaining eight books of the *De Trinitate*. In a characteristic expression of his idea that faith should seek understanding, Augustine ends the Preface to Book 8 with these words: "let us hold fast to this rule, that what has not yet become clear to our intellect may still be preserved by the firmness of our faith."

The idea that faith should seek understanding raises, for Augustine, a characteristic philosophical puzzle. This puzzle is a close relative of the "Paradox of Inquiry" to be found in Plato's *Meno* (at 80de). In Plato the puzzle is that one cannot, it seems, search for what virtue is, since, if one already knows, there is nothing to search for, and if one does not, one will not know how to aim one's search properly, or how to recognize virtue, should one happen to stumble upon it.

At the beginning of his *Confessions* Augustine puzzles over a question closely related to the Paradox of Inquiry. Augustine's question there is whether one can pray that one may come to know God. He assumes that one can. But how, he wants to know, can one know which being to address one's prayer to, unless one already knows God, whom one wants to come to know?[2]

In Book 8 of the *De Trinitate* Augustine's question is somewhat different again, yet also related to both Plato's Paradox of Inquiry and the *Confessions* passage. "Unless we love [God] now," he writes here, "we shall never see Him." Then he adds: "But who loves that which he does not know?" (DT 8.4.6). The worry is, presumably, that we would not seek to know God, unless we already loved him, but we could not love him unless we already knew him.

In an effort to get this paradox out of the way, Augustine begins to reflect on the phenomenon of loving a human person one does not really know. Consider someone whom we have never met, perhaps someone who is now dead – for example, the Apostle Paul. How can we love the Apostle Paul, he asks, when we do not know him? Even to be able to think about him, Augustine reasons, we must be able to represent him to ourselves (DT 8.4.7).

After a brief consideration of how we might be able to represent to ourselves the Divine Trinity, Augustine returns to the Apostle Paul. How do we picture Paul to ourselves? Whatever physical features we give Paul

[2] *Confessions* 1.1.1.

in our mental representation of him, Augustine reasons, it will not be because of those physical features that we love Paul, but rather because of the justice of his soul. Assuming for the moment that we somehow know what justice is, how do we know what a human soul or mind (*animus*) is. Each of us knows what a human soul is, Augustine answers, by virtue of the fact that each of us has a human soul. Augustine will return, in Book 10, to the issue of what this item of self-knowledge consists in. Here, in Book 8, he raises the question of how one moves from the recognition that one has, oneself, a mind or soul to the recognition that there are other minds or souls as well.

The problem of other minds

Augustine raises in Book 8 of the *De Trinitate*, apparently for the first time in Western philosophy, a problem central to modern, post-Cartesian philosophy, namely, the Problem of Other Minds. Remarkably, Augustine not only poses this now famous problem, he also offers what has been, in the Modern period, the most common response to it, namely, the Argument from Analogy for Other Minds. Here is the passage:

> For we recognize, from a likeness to us, the motions of bodies by which we perceive that others besides us live. Just as we move [our] body in living, so, we notice, those bodies are moved. For when a living body is moved there is no way open to our eyes to see the mind [*animus*], a thing which cannot be seen by the eyes. But we perceive something present in that mass such as is present in us to move our mass in a similar way; it is life and soul [*anima*]. Nor is such perception something peculiar to, as it were, human prudence and reason. For indeed beasts perceive as living, not only themselves, but also each other and one another, and us as well. Nor do they see our soul [*animas*], except from the motions of the body, and they do that immediately and very simply by a sort of natural agreement. Therefore we know the mind of anyone at all from our own; and from our own case we believe in that which we do not know [*ex nostro credimus quem non novimus*]. For not only do we perceive a mind, but we even know what one is by considering our own; for we have a mind. (DT 8.6.9)[3]

[3] For discussions of this passage, see Gareth B. Matthews, "Augustine on Reasoning from One's Own Case," *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 7 (1998), 115–28, and Matthews, *Thought's Ego in*

How does Augustine think we know, or come to know, what a mind is "from our own case"? For help in thinking about this we need to look to Book 9, where Augustine makes this comment:

> For it is not by seeing many minds [*mentes*] with our bodily eyes that we gather, by their similarity [*per similitudinem*], a general or special knowledge of the human mind; but we contemplate the inviolable truth, whence we can as perfectly as possible define, not what each man's mind is, but what it ought to be in the light of the eternal types. (DT 9.6.9)

Augustine's idea seems to be that, whereas we might come to contemplate the inviolable truth concerning what a triangle is by first seeing several visible triangles with our eyes and gaining a knowledge of *triangle* through their observed similarity,[4] we do not first see a number of minds with our eyes and through their observed similarity gain a knowledge of what a mind is. Rather we come to a knowledge of what a mind is simply by reflecting on what our own mind is.

Having come to know, from our own case, what a mind is, how is it that we come to see a mind in others? After all, a mind is "a thing which cannot be seen by the eyes."

According to the Argument from Analogy, which Augustine presents here, perhaps for the first time in the history of philosophy, we notice the similarity between the movements of other living bodies and our own and through this perceived similarity come to "perceive something present" in other bodies "such as is present in us to move our mass in a similar way." I direct my eyes toward a tree and, seeing a ripe-looking apple, move toward the tree, pick the apple and eat it. Later I observe another body, like mine, direct itself toward another apple, move toward the tree, pick the apple and eat it. I conclude that there is a mind in

Augustine and Descartes, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992, Chapter 9 ("The Problem of Other Minds").

[4] We must be careful here. Augustine is not an "abstractionist," but rather an "illuminationist" about knowledge acquisition. Thus he worries in his dialogue, *De Magistro* ("Concerning the Teacher") about "the ambiguity of ostension," that is, about how we could ever learn what say, the color, red, or the figure, triangle, is by having instances pointed out to us. Thus pointing to red by pointing to a red ball will also be pointing to a ball, pointing to maroon, pointing to color, etc. Nevertheless, Augustine, with his Doctrine of Illumination, came to think that seeing examples of, say, triangularity or redness, may be the occasion for an inner "illumination" by which we will understand what redness and triangularity are. Minds, however, are different in that the only one we can "see" is our own.

that other body with thoughts and desires similar to those in my own mind.

It is noteworthy that Augustine, in this passage, attributes to non-human animals an ability to do something similar to what we do when we deploy the Argument from Analogy for Other Minds. Perhaps his insistence that beasts do what they do "immediately and very simply by a sort of natural agreement" rules out the idea of a formal inference. Nevertheless, the idea that beasts with souls, but not minds, can do instinctively something similar to what we do by inference may seem to make them more like us than many philosophers have supposed.[5]

Mental trinities

At the very end of Book 8 Augustine introduces the first of what will eventually turn out to be a number of psychological or mental triads with which he hopes to illuminate the Divine Trinity. "Now love is [the love] of someone who loves", he writes, "and something is loved with love. So then there are three: the lover, the beloved, and the love" (DT 8.10.14). Although this triad – lover, beloved, and love – does not present quite the unity Augustine seeks as an image of the Divine Trinity, it certainly does, he thinks, move us in the right direction.

Beginning in Book 9 Augustine focuses not just on the human soul (*animus*), the source of human or rational life, but specifically on the seat of human consciousness, the mind (*mens*). It is specifically the mind that Augustine regards as the image of God, the *imago Dei*. And it is mental or psychological trinities that Augustine will seek to use to illuminate the Divine Trinity.

The first of these mental or psychological trinities that Augustine discusses in Book 9 is the one mentioned at the very end of the last book – lover, beloved, and love – but it is applied now to the mind's love of itself. "The mind cannot love itself unless it also knows itself," Augustine writes (DT 9.3.3). "Therefore," he goes on, "the mind itself, its love [of itself] and its knowledge [of itself] are a kind of trinity; these three are one, and when they are perfect they are equal" (DT 9.4.4). The lover and the beloved, the knower and the known, are all one; they are, in fact the mind. Yet they are three.

[5] See Gary Matthews, "Augustine and Descartes on the Souls of Animals," in *From Soul to Self*, ed. M. J. C. Crabbe, London: Routledge, 1999, 89–107.

Augustine concludes Book 9 with this summary statement of the first psychological trinity that, as he supposes, helps us to understand the Divine Trinity:

> And so there is a certain image of the Trinity: the mind itself, its knowledge, which is its offspring, and love as a third; these three are one and one substance. The offspring is not less, while the mind knows itself as much as it is; nor is the love less, while the mind loves itself as much as it knows and as much as it is. (DT 9.12.18)

One feature of this passage that may be especially striking to a post-Freudian reader is the assumption that no part or aspect of the mind is hidden to itself. If the mind were thought of as, in part, unavailable or inaccessible to itself, then the mind and what it knows or loves of itself would certainly not form a perfect unity.

It is somewhat puzzling that Augustine identifies the third item in this new triad as love, rather than what the mind loves, namely, itself. While it might be plausible to say that *what* the mind loves when it loves itself is just itself, the mind is certainly not identical with the love with which it loves itself.

What Augustine comes up with at the end of Book 10 is the triad, memory, understanding, and will. "Since these three, the memory, the understanding, and the will, are therefore, not three lives but one life, not three minds but one mind," he writes, "it follows that they are certainly not three substances, but one substance" (DT 10.11.18). He goes on to write: "For not only is each one comprehended by each one, but all are also comprehended by each one" (DT 10.11.18). What we might otherwise have thought of as "faculties" of the mind Augustine understands to be the mind as remembering, as understanding, and as willing. And they have a real unity, he supposes, as well as a real distinctness.

Mental language

In Chapter 7 of Book 9 Augustine appeals to the idea of thinking as inner speech. This idea is as old as Plato,[6] and as up-to-date as J. B. Watson,[7] Peter Geach,[8] and Jerry Fodor.[9] Among the interesting things Augustine says about the language of thought is this:

[6] *Theaetetus* 189e–190a and *Sophist* 263e.
[7] J. B. Watson, *Behaviorism: An Introduction to Comparative Psychology*, New York: Holt, 1914.
[8] Peter Geach, *Mental Acts*, New York: Humanities Press, 1957.
[9] Jerry Fodor, *The Language of Thought*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

> Thus there is nothing that we do through the members of our body, in our words and actions, by which the conduct of men is approved or disapproved, that is not preceded by the word that has been brought forth within us. For no one willingly does anything which he has not spoken previously in this heart. (DT 9.7.12)

In Book 15 Augustine returns to the idea of mental language. Augustine is at pains to distinguish: (a) the "words" of a thought not yet expressed in any natural language; (b) the inner rehearsal of words of a natural language that give expression to (a); (c) the spoken words that express (a); and (d) the written words that signify (c). As for (a), Augustine says this:

> Whoever, then, can understand the word, not only before it sounds, but even before the images of its sound are contemplated in thought – such a word belongs to no language, that is, to none of the so-called national languages, of which ours is Latin – whoever, I say, can understand this, can already see through this mirror and in this enigma some likeness of that Word [viz., Jesus Christ] of whom it was said: "In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God; and the Word was God" [*John* 1:1]. (15.10.19)

As for (b), he writes: "For all words, no matter in what language they may sound, are also thought in silence" (DT 15.11.20). As for (c) and (d), he writes that "letters have also been found by which we can also talk to those who are absent; but the letters are the signs of [spoken] words, while the words themselves in our speech are signs of the things of which we are thinking" (DT 15.10.19).

Mind–body dualism

If DT 8–15 is viewed, as I have suggested it should be, as Augustine's treatise on the philosophy of mind, Book 10 must be seen as the centerpiece of that treatise. There is nothing else of comparable power or originality on this topic until Descartes' *Meditations*.

Taking the classical command, "Know thyself!" as an admonition to the mind to know itself, Augustine first puzzles over how the mind can be motivated to seek to know itself. It needs to love itself already, he reasons, to motivate the search to know itself, yet it must already know itself to love itself. In the first sections of the book Augustine offers several models of inquiry that seem to allow for enough knowledge of what is being inquired

into to motivate the inquiry without requiring complete knowledge, which would, of course, make further inquiry otiose.

The models of inquiry Augustine discusses include inquiry into what one knows (a) only indirectly or (b) only partially or (c) only by description. None of these will help if, as Augustine supposes, nothing is more present to itself than the mind is present to itself.

How does Augustine think something can be present to the mind? He thinks there are three ways. First, a physical object, say, a tree, may be present to the mind through the bodily senses – in this case, through sight and touch. Second, that same tree may be present to the mind through a memory image, and a generalized version of it through an image of the imagination. Finally, numbers and eternal truths may be present to the mind quite directly, according to Augustine. One can, it is true, represent numbers or eternal truths to the mind for its contemplation, but one need not. The mind has direct access to them.

The mind, Augustine insists, is present to itself, not through an image or through any other representation, but simply through itself. Thus the mind is present to itself *immediately* and *non-representationally*.

The idea that the mind is present to itself non-representationally gives Augustine an argument for saying that the mind is incorporeal. Suppose it were something corporeal, say, the brain. Then, for the mind to be able to think of itself, it would have to be possible for the *brain* to be present to the mind non-representationally. The mind would, as Augustine puts it,

> think of this thing [that is, the brain] in a different way from [the way in which it thinks of] other [material] things, not, namely, through an image figment [*non scilicet per imaginale figmentum*], in the way that absent things touched by a sense of the body are brought to mind . . . not [just] by a mock-up [*simulata*] but rather by [its] inner presence. For there is nothing more present to [the mind] than itself. (DT 10.10.16)

Yet, Augustine insists, neither the brain nor any other material thing can be present to the mind immediately and non-representationally, the way the mind can be present to itself. So the mind is not the brain, or anything material.[10]

[10] Lynne Baker has suggested the following counter-argument to me:
(1) I am present immediately and non-representationally to myself.
(2) I am a person, who is essentially embodied.

The model of inquiry that Augustine accepts as appropriate for the mind to use in following the admonition, "Know thyself!" is what we might call "the perfection model." Nothing is already so present to the mind as itself, yet the mind may seek to know itself more perfectly by eliminating from its consideration of itself those bodily associations that may obscure its understanding of itself. As he puts the point in Book 14, the mind "does not always think itself to be distinct from those things that are not itself" (DT 14.7.9). For the mind to seek itself is for it to seek to eliminate the bodily dross that may obscure its vision of itself.

What can the mind hope to discover about itself, once it has directed its attention to itself and away from the physical objects that have distracted it and led it to suppose that it is something it is not? We might have expected Augustine to describe for us the contents of his own consciousness, or some introspected "innermost self." Instead, Augustine invites us to think about the things the mind cannot doubt about itself. They include these: that it lives, remembers, understands, wills, thinks, knows, and judges (DT 10.10.14).

We moderns may have been persuaded by Descartes[11] that *living* does not belong in a list of mental functions that the mind cannot doubt that it has. But "life" and "living" in this Augustinian context have to be taken, I think, in the sense that is natural for understanding the question, "Is there life after death?" where the questioner may not even be interested in whether there is biological life after death. If we understand "living" that way, Augustine's account of what a mind indubitably is makes a mind what Descartes calls a "thinking thing" (*res cogitans*).

(3) Persons essentially embodied are material objects.
Therefore,
(4) A material object can be present immediately and non-representationally to itself.

Since Augustine clearly rejects the conclusion of this argument, and since, with the addition of an innocuous premise, the conclusion does indeed follow from the premises, Augustine must reject one of the premises. He accepts (1). So he must reject (2) or (3), or both.

11 "primitive man probably did not distinguish between, on the one hand, the principle by which we are nourished and grow and accomplish without any thought all the other operations which we have in common with the brutes, and, on the other hand, the principle in virtue of which we think. He therefore used the single term 'soul' to apply to both; and when he subsequently noticed that thought was distinct from nutrition, he called the element which thinks 'mind,' and believed it to be the principal part of the soul. I, by contrast, realizing that the principle by which we are nourished is wholly different – different in kind – from that in virtue of which we think, have said that the term 'soul,' when it is used to refer to both these principles is ambiguous" (Descartes, "Fifth Set of Replies," *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, trans. J. Cottingham, R. Stoothoff, and D. Murdoch, vol. II, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984, 246).

Among the many other points of philosophical interest in Book 10 is the concept of body that Augustine seems to be working with. It seems to be almost as Cartesian as his concept of mind. A corporeal substance, he tells us, occupies "less extension of place with a less part of itself, and a greater with a greater part" (DT 10.7.10). Body is thus apparently what Descartes calls "extended thing" (*res extensa*).

Sense perception

In Book 11 Augustine turns to sense perception. In keeping with his trinitarian theme, he distinguishes:

> first, the object which we see, whether a stone, or a flame, or anything that can be seen by the eyes, and this can naturally exist even before it was seen; secondly, the vision, which was not there before we perceived the object that was presented to the sense; thirdly, the power that fixes the sense of sight on the object that is seen as long as it is seen, namely, the attention of the mind. (DT 11.2.2)

The first object of this trinity is not anything mental. So this trinity is not purely mental or psychological in the way the ones in Books 9 and 10 were. Yet at the moment of perception there is, Augustine thinks, a unity of physical object perceived, sensory form received, and attention of the perceiving mind that is, in fact, a real unity. The connection between them, he writes, "is so close that there is no room for distinguishing them" (DT 11.2.3).

As evidence for there being in perception a form of the physical object perceived, distinct from the object itself, Augustine points to the image that is retained in memory, as well as to after-images and double-images (DT 11.2.4). Because Augustine thinks we must reflect on the phenomena of perception to distinguish the physical object perceived and the form of the object that arises in perception it seems clear that he is not a representationalist in perception. That is, he does not suppose that the sensory image is the direct or true object of sense perception. Rather, the sensory image is something that arises in perception and may be preserved in memory, or distorted as an after-image or as a double-image.

In the style of the British empiricists Augustine denies that we can know any sensory quality or shape that we have not previously perceived. "For it is impossible," he writes,

> to form any concept at all of a color or of a bodily figure that one has never seen, or of a sound that one has never heard, or of a flavor that one has never tasted, or of an odor that one has never smelled, or of any touch of a corporeal object that one has never felt. (DT 11.8.14)

We can imagine sensible objects we have never seen and patterns of sound we have never heard, he supposes, by putting together mental images of elements – colors, shapes, sounds – we have perceived.

The doctrine of illumination

After asking in Book 8 how one knows what a mind is, Augustine moves on there to consider how it is we can know what justice is. We can know this, he insists, even if our own soul is not just. His idea seems to be that we have direct access to something like the Platonic Form of justice. "But the wonderful thing is," he writes at DT 8.6.9, "that the soul should see within itself what it has not seen anywhere else, and should see truly, and should see the truly just soul itself, and that itself is indeed a soul, and yet not the just soul that it sees within itself." (Augustine hardly ever misses an opportunity to clothe his insights in the language of paradox!)

In Book 12 Augustine describes what we might think of as the Platonic world of Forms, accessible, he tells us, to "wisdom" (*sapientia*). These things which, he writes,

> neither have been nor shall be, but which are; and on account of that eternity in which they are, it is said of them that they have been, are, and shall be without any changeableness of times. For they have not been in such a way that they have ceased to be, nor shall they be in such a way as if they were not now, but they always had and always will have the self-same being. But they abide not as bodies fixed in space and place, but as intelligible things in their incorporeal nature they are so present to the gaze of the mind, as those visible and tangible things are present in their places to the senses of the body. (DT 12.14.23)

This book also includes an amusing reference to the "slave-boy" passage in Plato's dialogue, *Meno* (at 82b–86c). Although Augustine may not have read the Platonic dialogue itself, he surely knew of it from his reading of Cicero.[12] In any case, he comments that, if coming to know through

[12] See Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* 1.24.57.

questioning how to construct a square with an area twice that of a given square were really a matter of recollecting what one knew in a previous life, few people would be able to do it. "For not all have been geometricians in their previous life," Augustine writes, "since there are so few of them in the human race that one can hardly be found" (DT 12.15.24).

Augustine's serious point is this: "But we ought rather to believe that the nature of the intellectual mind is so formed as to see those things which, according to the disposition of the Creator, are subjoined to intelligible things in the natural order, in a sort of incorporeal light of its own kind . . . " (DT 12.15.24). The thesis in Augustine that we can see intelligible things in the light of reason is called the *Doctrine of Illumination*.

Happiness

In Chapter 3 of Book 13 Augustine restates a claim that he makes in several different works, namely, the claim that everyone wants to be happy (*beati*). Speaking of an imaginary character he has been describing, he writes:

> If he had said, "All of you want to be happy [*beati*] and you do not want to be miserable," he would have said something that no one would have failed to acknowledge in his own will. For whatever else it is that anyone secretly wills, he does not withdraw from this want [*voluntas*], which is sufficiently known to all and is in everyone. (DT 13.3.6)

In the next chapter Augustine turns his attention to the fact that people have very different aims in life. His concern is that the obvious diversity in aims that people pursue casts doubt on the assumption that everyone knows what happiness is, and therefore on the claim that everyone wants to be happy. "For if all knew it [that is, happiness, *beatitudo*]," he writes,

> it would not be considered by some to be in the goodness of soul, by others in the pleasure of the body, by others in both, by some in this thing, and by others in that thing. For as anything particularly pleased them, so they found in it the happy life [*beata vita*]. How, then, can all love so ardently what all do not know? (DT 13.4.7)

Augustine considers denying what, he says, not even the "Academician Cicero" doubted, namely, that everyone wants to be happy. But he rejects that move. In Chapter 5 he tries out the commonsensical suggestion that

happiness is just pleasure and people have different aims in life because they find pleasure in different things. But he rejects that suggestion on the ground that, if I take pleasure in something that is bad for me, I am not made happy by taking pleasure in it.

Augustine's way out of his conundrum is to propose what we might call a "formal conception" of happiness. That person alone is happy, Augustine writes, "who has all that he wants and wants nothing wrongly" (DT 13.5.8). If we accept this concept of happiness, then it is reasonably plausible to say that (1) everyone wants to be happy and yet (2) people pursue widely different aims in life, and (3) people want things that, in fact, do not make them happy.

Does everyone accept this formal concept of happiness? It is unreasonable to suppose that everyone would give immediate expression to it, if asked what happiness is. But it is quite plausible to think that people might generally agree to it, if it were explained to them. If that is right, then even if it is something of an overstatement to say that everyone knows what happiness is, it will be plausible to think that people in general have enough of a common conception of happiness for it to be coherent to claim that everyone wants to be happy.

Language learning

Early on in Book 14 Augustine reflects on some of his conclusions from Book 10. Rehearsing his contention that "the mind knows nothing so well as that which is present to itself, and nothing is more present to the mind than it is to itself" (DT 14.5.7), Augustine now asks about the mind of an infant. "Are we also to believe," he asks, "that it knows itself, but is too intent on those things through which it begins to experience pleasure through the senses of the body . . . ?"

The discussion that follows is rather noncommittal, yet interesting for at least two reasons. First, it is one of the earliest excursions into the psychology of infants and young children. And, second, its agnosticism contrasts sharply with claims about language acquisition in young children to be found in Augustine's *Confessions* in this passage, with which Wittgenstein begins his *Philosophical Investigations*:

> When they [my elders] named some object, and accordingly moved towards something, I saw this and I grasped that the thing was called

> by the sound they uttered when they meant to point it out. Their intention was shown by their bodily movements, as it were, the natural language of all peoples: the expression of the fact, the play of the eyes, the movement of other parts of the body, and the tone of voice which expresses our state of mind in seeking, having, rejecting, or avoiding something. Thus, as I heard words repeatedly used in their proper places in various sentences, I gradually learnt to understand what objects they signified; and after I had trained my mouth to form these signs, I used them to express my own desires. (*Confessions* 1.6.8)[13]

Perhaps also worthy of mention is the rather tentative suggestion of what later in philosophy came to be called "the doctrine of privileged access." "For what do we know," Augustine asks rhetorically, "if we do not know what is in our [own] mind, since all that we know, we cannot know except with our [own] mind" (DT 14.5.8).

Divine simplicity

Beginning in Chapter 3 of Book 15 Augustine presents a summary of the previous fourteen books. Then, beginning in Chapter 5, Augustine develops the doctrine of the Divine Simplicity, which he had already introduced in Book 7 (see above). "For one and the same thing is therefore said," Augustine writes,

> whether God is called eternal, or immortal, or incorruptible, or unchangeable; and similarly, when He is called living and understanding . . . one and the same thing is said. For He has not obtained the wisdom by which He is wise, but He Himself is wisdom. And this life is the same as this strength or this power, and the same as this beauty by which He is called powerful and beautiful . . . Or again are goodness and justice also different from each other in the nature of God, as they are different in their works, as if they were two different qualities of God, one His goodness and the other His justice? Certainly not! (DT 15.5.7)

In Chapter 7 Augustine moves on to the idea that God's knowledge of everything past, present, and future is a knowledge in his Divine present. "What man, therefore, can comprehend," he asks,

[13] G. E. M. Anscombe's translation in Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1953, 2e.

> that wisdom by which God knows all things, and in such a way that what are called past things are not past for Him, nor does He await the coming of what are called future things as though they were absent, but both past and future things are all present together with present things? (DT 15.7.13)

God sees all things, past, present, and future, Augustine adds, not seriatim but "in a single glance" (DT 15.7.13).

Skepticism and the *cogito*

Chapter 12 of Book 15 is one the most famous chapters in the whole work. It is a response to "academic" skepticism, that is, a response to "doubting everything." There is a passage parallel to DT 15.12.21 in the *City of God* at 11.26. It begins with a very brief summary of the *De Trinitate*:

> We do indeed recognize in ourselves an image of God, that is, of the Supreme Trinity. It is not an adequate image, but a very distant parallel. It is not co-eternal and, in brief, it is not of the same substance as God. For all that, there is nothing in the whole of God's creation so near to him in nature . . . We resemble the Divine Trinity in that we exist, we know that we exist, and we are glad of this existence and this knowledge . . .
>
> In respect of those truths I have no fear of the arguments of the Academics. They say, "Suppose you are mistaken?" I reply, "If I am mistaken, I exist" [*si fallor, sum*]. A non-existent being cannot be mistaken; therefore I must exist, if I am mistaken. Then since my being mistaken proves that I exist, how can I be mistaken in thinking that I exist, seeing that my mistake establishes my existence.

Although DT 15.12.21 is somewhat more expansive than this, it follows a similar line of thought – except that, whereas in the *City of God* Augustine talks about his knowledge that he *exists*, the comparable claim in the *De Trinitate* is a claim that he *lives*. As mentioned above, "lives" and "life" in the *De Trinitate* are often to be understood, not in a specifically biological sense, but rather in the sense in which one can ask, "Is there life after death?" and not be asking about whether one might survive death specifically as a biological organism. If "life" and "live" are understood this way, then the obvious discrepancy between *De Trinitate* 15.12.21 and *City of God* 11.26 disappears.

Influence of *De Trinitate*

The *De Trinitate* was widely read by Christian philosophers from the early medieval period into the seventeenth century. In what follows I shall make a few connections between some of the ideas discussed above and the thought of several medieval and modern philosophers.

The influence of Augustine on St. Anselm of Canterbury (1033–1109) is difficult to overestimate. As Jasper Hopkins notes, "Augustine is the major source upon whom Anselm draws." Hopkins adds:

> Although mentioned by name only six times, [Augustine's] influence is preponderant. Even where Anselm does not cite him directly, he appropriates examples, poses problems in exactly the same way, and borrows arguments without acknowledgment.[14]

Hopkins offers detailed comparisons between Augustine's *De Trinitate* and Anselm's treatment of the same subject, particularly in his *Monologion*.[15] However, among the Augustinian ideas discussed above, it is clearly the notion of *Faith in Search of Understanding* that is most closely associated with Anselm's thought. Indeed, "Faith in Search of Understanding" (*fides quaerens intellectum*) is a title sometimes given to Anselm's most important work, the *Proslogion*, in which he presents his famous ontological argument. And the first chapter of that work ends with these unmistakably Augustinian words:

> For I do not seek to understand that I may believe, but I believe in order to understand. For this also I believe, that unless I believed, I should not understand.

The idea of the *Divine Simplicity*, often with explicit reference to Augustine's *De Trinitate*, is a staple of medieval philosophical theology. This idea is certainly prominent in Anselm; but it is also central to the conception of God we find in St. Thomas Aquinas (1225–74), who buttresses his appeal to this idea by appeal to the authority of Augustine. Thus, in Article 7 of Question 3 in the *prima pars* of his *Summa Theologiae*, Aquinas quotes Augustine as saying, "God is truly and absolutely simple," which is apparently meant to be a summary of DT 6.6.8.

[14] Jasper Hopkins, *A Companion to the Study of St. Anselm*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1972, 16.

[15] *Ibid.*, Chapter IV, "Doctrine of the Trinity."

Among the important medieval philosophers one would not have expected to show much Augustinian influence is William of Ockham (1285–1347). Nevertheless, in the first chapter of book one of his *Summa totius logicae*, where Ockham introduces the important idea of conceptual or mental terms, he writes this:

> These conceptual terms and the propositions formed by them are those mental words which Saint Augustine says in *De Trinitate* 15 do not belong to any language; they remain only in the mind and cannot be uttered outwardly. Nevertheless vocal words which are signs subordinated to these can be uttered outwardly.

Here Ockham considers himself to be appealing to the idea of *Mental Language* he finds in Augustine.

René Descartes (1596–1650) is obviously the philosopher one would naturally select as the one most deeply influenced by Augustine's *De Trinitate*. The concept of mind that emerges in DT, even the concept of body one finds there, strikes the modern reader as surprisingly Cartesian. The internalist argumentation to support *Mind-Body Dualism* seems quite Cartesian. And, of course, Descartes' *cogito*, as a response to skepticism, seems to echo the *cogito*-like passage in DT 15.

There is, however, a paradox here. Unlike Anselm, Aquinas, Ockham, and most other philosophers influenced by Augustine, Descartes never acknowledges any influence from him at all. In a letter to Colvius, 14 November 1640, Descartes writes this:

> I am obliged to you for drawing my attention to the passage of St. Augustine relevant to my *I am thinking, therefore I exist*. I went today to the library of this town to read it, and I find that he does really use it to prove the certainty of our existence. He goes on to show that there is a certain likeness of the Trinity in us, in that we exist, we know that we exist, and we love the existence and the knowledge we have. I, on the other hand, use the argument to show that this I which is thinking is an immaterial substance with no bodily element. These are two very different things.[16]

It is hard to believe that Descartes was being candid in suggesting that he first read Augustine's *City of God* 11.26, or *De Trinitate* 15.12.21,

[16] *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, trans. J. Cottingham, S. Stoothoff, D. Murdoch, and A. Kenny, vol. III, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, 83–84.

in 1640, three years after he had published the *Discourse*, in which he formulated his *cogito*. But asking whether Descartes is candid in professing ignorance of Augustine is far less interesting than reflecting on the many significant similarities (and differences!) between his arguments for mind–body dualism and Augustine's, or between his use of the *cogito* in response to skepticism and that of Augustine.[17]

Unlike Descartes, Nicolas Malebranche (1638–1715) readily acknowledges his debt to Augustine. Book II, Part 2, Chapter 6, of his *Search after Truth* includes a substantial quotation from DT 14 expressing the *Doctrine of Illumination*. Malebranche comments:

> Saint Augustine has an infinity of such passages by which he proves that we already see God in this life through the knowledge we have of eternal truths. The truth is uncreated, immutable, immense, eternal, and above all things . . . Only God can have all these perfections. Therefore, truth is God. We see some of these immutable, eternal truths. Therefore, we see God. These are the arguments of Saint Augustine – ours are somewhat different, and we have no wish to make improper use of the authority of so great a man in order to support our own view. We are of the opinion, then, that truths, even those that are eternal, such as that twice two is four, are not absolute beings, much less that they are God Himself. For clearly, this truth consists only in the relation of equality between twice two and four. Thus we do not claim, as does Saint Augustine, that we see God in seeing truths, but in seeing the *ideas* of these truths . . . Thus, our view is that we see God when we see eternal truths, and not that these truths are God, because the ideas on which these truths depend are in God.[18]

With characteristic modesty Malebranche adds: "it might even be that this was Saint Augustine's meaning."

Descartes does not recognize the *Problem of Other Minds* in his writings, although other philosophers soon recognized that it was a genuine difficulty for his *Mind–Body Dualism*. Malebranche, however, does recognize the problem and offers a solution to it.[19] In this respect, too, he is a close student of Augustine, and of Augustine's *De Trinitate*.

[17] See Matthews, *Thought's Ego in Augustine and Descartes*, especially Chapter 2 ("The Cartesian Cogito") and Chapter 3 ("The Augustinian Cogito").

[18] *The Search After Truth*, trans. T. M. Lennon and P. J. Olscamp, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 233–34.

[19] *Ibid.*, 3.7.5 ("How we know other men's souls").

Chronology

354	birth in Thagaste, North Africa (modern Souk Ahras, Algeria)
366	school at Madauros
370	begins study at Carthage
372	birth of son, Adeodatus
373	teacher at Thagaste
376	teacher of rhetoric at Carthage
383	sailed to Rome
384	professor of rhetoric at Milan
386	conversion to Christianity
387/8	death of mother, Monica; return to Thagaste
389	Adeodatus's death
391	ordained priest at Hippo Regius
395/6	consecrated as bishop
397	begins *Confessions* (completed 401)
399	begins *De Trinitate* (completed between 422 and 426)
410	sack of Rome
413	begins *City of God* (completed 427)
430	death in Hippo

Further reading

The translation used here, by Stephen McKenna, appeared as *The Trinity* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1961), which is volume 45 in the series The Fathers of the Church. McKenna's translation of Books 8–15 has been revised for this edition. For purposes of comparison and elucidation a nineteenth-century translation of *De Trinitate* by Arthur West Haddan can be recommended. It is currently available in volume 3 of *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993), 1–228. Although the Haddan translation is perhaps the most scholarly translation of *De Trinitate* available in English, its language is somewhat antiquated and foreign to the contemporary reader. A completely new translation, with introduction and notes by Edmund Hill (Saint Augustine, *The Trinity*, Brooklyn: New City Press, 1991) can also be recommended. This translation, which appears in the series, The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, is perhaps the most readable of all, but it is also the freest. Aside from the fact that it does take some liberties to try to make Augustine more accessible, its main drawback from a philosophical point of view is that the focus of the accompanying apparatus is almost exclusively theological. One can certainly gain from it a deep understanding of the theological significance of *De Trinitate*. But one may well come away from reading it with little inkling of the work's philosophical significance.

For a general overview of Augustine's philosophy see the entry, "Augustine," in the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. E. Craig (London: Routledge, 1998), vol. 1, 541–59. The standard biography of Augustine in English is P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1967). For an encyclopedia of information on Augustine's life and each of his works see *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. A. D. Fitzgerald (Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 1999). For philosophically informative articles on major topics in Augustine, including a helpful article by Mary T. Clark specifically on

the *De Trinitate*, see *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, ed. E. Stump and N. Kretzmann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). Also valuable is a collection of articles on various aspects of Augustine's philosophical thought and influence by twenty different scholars, *The Augustinian Tradition*, ed. G. B. Matthews (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999).

Among the many books available on various aspects of the philosophy of Augustine, the following are particularly helpful: B. Bubacz, *St. Augustine's Theory of Knowledge: A Contemporary Analysis* (New York: Mellen, 1981); P. Cary, *Augustine's Invention of the Inner Self* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); H. Chadwick, *Augustine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); A. Dihle, *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1982); L. Hölscher, *The Reality of the Mind: Augustine's Philosophical Arguments for the Human Soul as a Spiritual Substance* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986); C. Kirwan, *Augustine* (London: Routledge, 1989); G. O'Daly, *Augustine's Philosophy of Mind* (London: Duckworth, 1987); J. M. Rist, *Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); and J. Wetzel, *Augustine and the Limits of Virtue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Ever since Descartes invited several of his contemporaries to offer objections to his *Meditations*, philosophers have been interested in the extent to which Descartes borrowed his ideas from Augustine. Two recent contributions to this centuries-old discussion have focused more on the philosophical significance of the parallels, rather than on questions of originality and whether Descartes was being candid when he disavowed influence from Augustine. One is S. Menn, *Descartes and Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) and the other is Gareth B. Matthews, *Thought's Ego in Augustine and Descartes* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992).

Summary of Books 1–7

As Augustine himself makes clear at the beginning of Book 15, in his own summary of the fourteen preceding books at DT 15.3.5, the first four books of *De Trinitate* are devoted to establishing the scriptural foundation for the Doctrine of the Trinity. It is especially important to Augustine to make clear in these books that the Son, the second person of the Trinity, is not "less than He who sends, because the latter sends and the former is sent, since the Trinity, which is equal in all things, and is also equally unchangeable in its nature, invisible, and present everywhere, works inseparably" (DT 15.3.5).

The next three books, Books 5 through 7, are more philosophical than what had preceded. They are aimed at developing a philosophical, and especially a metaphysical, vocabulary for talk about God. Thus in Book 5 Augustine insists that "nothing can be said of God according to accident, because nothing accidental can happen to Him" (DT 5.5.6). Indeed, he goes on, there is nothing changeable in God at all. Yet, he adds, we may say some things about God relatively, or *in relation*, "as the relation of Father to Son, and of Son to Father." However, he continues, "There is no question here of an accident, because the one is always the Father and the other is always the Son" (DT 5.5.6).

So far, then, Augustine allows in talk about God two kinds of "proper predication," substantial predication and relative predication. Other talk about God, he insists, is only metaphorical. Specifically, "position, habit, place, and time cannot be predicated of God in the proper sense, but only metaphorically and by means of similitudes" (DT 5.8.9).

Particularly interesting in Book 6 is Augustine's discussion of the Doctrine of the Unity of the Virtues, something to be found in the writings

of Plato[1] and Aristotle.[2] Augustine, as we might expect, applies it to his Trinity project. "The virtues," Augustine writes,

> are in the human soul in a similar way [that is, similar to the way greatness is in the Father and greatness is in the Son]. Although each of them has a fixed and clearly defined meaning, yet one can in no way be separated from the others, so that those who are equal to one another, for example, in courage, are likewise equal in prudence, temperance, and justice. For if you say that they are equal in courage, but that one excels in prudence, then it follows that the courage of the other is less prudent and they are not really equal in courage when the courage of the one is more prudent. (DT 6.4.6)

Early on in Book 7 Augustine subscribes to some of the main tenets of Platonism, including the idea that a soul becomes wise "by participation in wisdom" and even that "wisdom is both wise and is wise in itself" (DT 7.1.2). Claims of the latter sort are said in the literature on Plato to make the "self-predication assumption."

At DT 7.4.7 Augustine remarks, sensibly, that if Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three, we are entitled to ask, "Three *what*?" Not surprisingly, he rejects the answer, "Three gods." In an interesting discussion he argues for "Three persons" instead.

Although in three passages–5.2.3, 5.8.10, and 7.4.7–Augustine had stated that Latin makes no real distinction between *substantia*, "substance," and *essentia*, "essence," he makes clear why he prefers to speak of God as an essence, rather than as a substance. If God may be properly called a "substance," he writes,

> then there is something in Him as in a subject, and He is no longer simple; His being, accordingly, would not be one and the same with the other qualities that are predicated of Him in respect to Himself . . . But it is wrong to assert that God subsists and is the subject of His own goodness . . . that God Himself is not His own goodness, and that it inheres in Him as in its subject. It is, therefore, obvious that God is improperly called "a substance." (DT 7.5.10)

[1] See *Laches* 199de and *Protagoras* 329d.
[2] See *Nicomachean Ethics* 1144b33–1145a2.

On the Trinity

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Book 8

Outline

1. In the Divine Trinity, paradoxically, three persons are not greater than one. (1.1)
2. All bodily analogies to the relationships among the persons of the Trinity mislead. (2.3)
3. There would be no changeable goods, unless there were an unchangeable good. (3.4–5)
4. To think of a bodily thing our mind must represent to itself something with bodily features. (4.6–7)
5. We can represent the Virgin Mary and the Apostle Paul to our mind through a bodily image. (5.7–8)
6. We know what a mind is because we have one. (6.9)
7. We know there are other minds by analogical reasoning. (6.9)
8. We can know what a *just* mind or soul is through knowledge of the form of justice. (6.9)
9. We love God and our neighbors from the same love. (7.10–10.14)

Preface

In this Trinity, as we have said elsewhere, those names, which are predicated relatively, the one of the other, are properly spoken of[1] as belonging to each person in particular, as Father and Son, and the Gift of both, the Holy Spirit; for the Father is not the Trinity, nor the Son the Trinity, nor

[1] Augustine here draws on his distinction between substantial predication and relative predication, which is introduced in Book 5 and discussed briefly in the Introduction above.

the Gift the Trinity. But when they are spoken of singly with respect to themselves, then they are not spoken of as three in the plural number but as one, the Trinity itself. Thus the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God; the Father is good, the Son is good, the Holy Spirit is good; and the Father is omnipotent, the Son is omnipotent, and the Holy Spirit is omnipotent; but yet there are not three gods, nor three goods, nor three omnipotents, but one God, one good, and one omnipotent, the Trinity itself. And the same applies to everything else that may be said of them, not in relation of one to the other, but individually in respect to themselves.

These things are said essentially,[2] for in them to be is the same as to be great, to be good, to be wise, and whatever else is predicated of each person therein with respect to themselves or of the Trinity itself.[3] And, therefore, they are called three persons or three substances, not that any diversity of essence is to be understood, but so that we may be able to answer by some one word when anyone asks three what or what three things. So great is the equality in this Trinity, that not only is the Father not greater than the Son in that which pertains to the divinity, but neither are the Father and the Son anything greater than the Holy Spirit, nor is each person singly, whichever of the three it may be, anything less than the Trinity itself.

These are the things that we have affirmed; and the more often we repeat and discuss them, then, of course, the more familiar the knowledge of them will become to us; but at the same time we also have to set some limit to our treatise. And we must supplicate God with the most devout piety, that He may open our understanding and take away the spirit of contention, in order that our mind may gaze upon the essence of the truth that is without any bulk and without any mutability. Therefore, insofar as the Creator Himself in His marvelous mercy comes to our help, let us turn our attention to these subjects, which we shall analyze in a more inward way[4] than the preceding things, although they are the very same things. Meanwhile let us hold fast to this rule, that what has not yet become clear to our intellect may still be preserved by the firmness of our faith.[5]

[2] *secundum essentiam.* Given Augustine's distinction between two kinds of "proper" or non-accidental predication, namely, substantial and relative predication, what is said *secundum essentiam* is predicated substantially, rather than relationally.

[3] The idea expressed here is called "the doctrine of divine simplicity." (See the Introduction under "Divine simplicity.")

[4] *modo interiore.*

[5] Augustine here suggests the guiding principle of his philosophical theology, *fides quaerens intellectum* ("faith in search of understanding"). Seven centuries later St. Anselm used this phrase

Chapter 1

(2) For we say that in this Trinity two or three persons are not greater than one alone. Our carnal perception cannot grasp this, because it only perceives, as it can, the true [or: real][6] things that are created, but is unable to discern the truth itself by which they have been created. If it could do so, then that very corporeal light itself would be in no way more clear than this that we have just said. For, in relation to the substance of truth, since truth alone truly is, nothing is greater unless it is more true [or: more real]. But with regard to whatever is intelligible and unchangeable, no one thing is more true than another, because all are equally and unchangeably eternal. What is called great, is great from no other source than from that by which it truly is.

Where, then, greatness itself is truth, whatever has more of greatness must necessarily have more of the truth. Therefore, whatever does not have more of the truth does not also have more of greatness. Again whatever has more of the truth is certainly more true [or: real], just as that which is greater has more of greatness; therefore, in regard to the substance of truth, that which is more true [or: real] is greater. But the Father and the Son together are not more true [or: real] than the Father singly or the Son singly. Therefore, both together are not something greater than each one by Himself alone. And because the Holy Spirit also truly is, so the Father and the Son together are not something greater than He, because they are not more true [or: more real] than He. The Father also and the Holy Spirit together do not surpass the Son in greatness, because they do not surpass Him in truth; they are not more true [or: more real]. And similarly the Son and the Holy Spirit together are something just as great as the Father alone, because they are just as truly as He is. Similarly, the Trinity itself is just as great as each one of the persons therein. For there, that is not greater which is not more true, where truth itself is greatness. Because in the essence of the truth, to be true is one and the same as to be, and to be is one and the same as to be great; therefore, to be great is one and the same as to be true. Consequently, what is there equally true, must there be also equally great.

as the subtitle for his famous *Proslogion*, in which he presents what has come to be called "the ontological argument."

[6] In this section Augustine's word for "true" also means "real."

Chapter 2

(3) In material things this and that gold can be equally true [or: real], and yet one can be greater than the other, because here greatness is not the same as truth, and because it is one thing for it to be gold and another thing for it to be great. The same is also true with regard to the nature of the soul, for it is not called a true soul in the same respect in which it is called a great soul. For he also has a true soul who has not a great soul, since the essence of the body and the soul is not the essence of the truth itself, as the Trinity is the one, the only, the great, the true, the truthful God, Truth itself.

And if we try to think of the Trinity, insofar as He allows and grants, let no one think of any kind of contact or embrace in space or in place, as though there were three bodies, nor of any knitting together of a joint, as the fables relate of the three-bodied Geryon, but let us reject whatsoever may occur to the mind that is of such a sort as to be greater in three than in each one singly, and less in one than in two, for in this way everything corporeal is rejected. But even in spiritual things let nothing changeable that may have occurred to the mind be thought of God. For when we aspire to that height from this depth, it is a step toward no small bit of knowledge if, before we can know what God is, we can already know what He is not.[7] For assuredly He is neither earth nor heaven, nor like earth and heaven, nor any such thing as we see in the heaven, nor any such thing as we do not see, and is perhaps in the heaven. Even if by the power of your imagination you magnify the light of the sun in your mind as much as you are able, either that it may be greater or that it may be brighter, a thousand times as much or innumerable times, yet even this is not God. Neither as the pure angels are thought of as animating heavenly bodies, changing and making use of them in accordance with the will by which they serve God, neither if all were brought together and became one – and there are thousands of thousands of them [*Daniel* 7:10; *Revelation* 5:11] – is any such thing God. Nor would it be so, even if you were to think of these same spirits without bodies, which is indeed extremely difficult for our carnal thought.

Behold and see if you can, O soul bowed down by the corruptible body [*Wisdom* 9:15] and laden by many and various kinds of earthly thoughts,

[7] The attempt to describe God by saying what God is *not* is called in later medieval philosophy "the negative way" (*via negativa*). Moses Maimonides (1135–1204) says that even claims about God made in the affirmative mode should be understood as implicit denials. See his *Guide for the Perplexed* 1.58.

behold, and see if you can that God is Truth. For it is written that "God is light" [*1 John* 1:5] not as these eyes see it, but as the heart sees it when it hears: "He is Truth" [*John* 14:6]. Do not ask: "What is Truth?" [*John* 18:38]. For at once the mists of bodily images and the clouds of phantasms will obstruct your view, and obscure the brightness which shone upon you at the first flash when I said "Truth." See, remain in that first flash in which you were dazzled as it were by its brightness, when it was said to you "Truth." Remain in it, if you can, but if you cannot, you will fall back into those wonted earthly thoughts. And what weight, pray, will finally cause you to fall back, if not the tenacity of the sinful desires that you have contracted and the errors of your earthly pilgrimage?

Chapter 3

(4) Behold, and again see if you can. Certainly you love only the good, because the earth is good by the height of its mountains, the moderate elevation of its hills, and the evenness of its fields; and good is the farm that is pleasant and fertile; and good is the house that is arranged throughout in symmetrical proportions and is spacious and bright; and good are the animals, animate bodies; and good is the mild and salubrious air; and good is the food that is pleasant and conducive to health; and good is health without pains and weariness; and good is the countenance of man with regular features, a cheerful expression, and a glowing color; and good is the soul[8] of a friend with the sweetness of concord and the fidelity of love; and good is the just man; and good are riches because they readily assist us; and good is the heaven with its own sun, moon, and stars; and good are the angels by their holy obedience; and good is the lecture that graciously instructs and suitably admonishes the listener; and good is the poem with its measured rhythm and the seriousness of its thoughts.

Why should I add still more? This good and that good; take away this and that, and see good itself if you can; so you will see God who is good not by another good, but is the good of every good. For in all these good

[8] Augustine's word here is *animus*, not *anima*. Quite consistently in this work Augustine uses *anima* for the principle of life to be found in all living beings, including human beings. He uses *animus* for the rational soul, which is to be found in human beings but, Augustine thinks, not in other animals. Later on, especially in Book 10, he focuses on *mens*, the conscious human self. McKenna has chosen to translate *animus* as "soul" here in Book 8, but the reader should be aware that, as we approach Augustine's discussion of the Problem of Other Minds in DT 8.6.9, it will become increasingly clear that it is the rational soul, or mind, that Augustine is especially interested in.

things, either those which I have enumerated, or any others which are seen or thought, we would be unable to call one better than the other, if we judge in accordance with the truth, if the idea of good itself had not been impressed upon us, according to which we approve of something as good, and also prefer one good to another. Thus God is to be loved, not as this or that good, but as good itself. For the good of the soul that is to be sought is not that over which one flies by judging, but that to which one adheres by loving, and what is this but God?[9] Not the good soul, nor the good angel, nor the good heaven, but the good. But perhaps what I wish to say may be grasped more readily in this manner. For example, when I hear that a soul is called good, as there are two words [i.e., "good" and "soul"], so from these words I understand two things: one by which it is a soul, the other by which it is good. And certainly the soul itself had nothing to do with making itself a soul, for at that time it was not, so that it could not bring about its own being. But I realize that an act of the will is necessary in order that it may be a good soul, not as though the soul itself were not something good by the very fact that it is a soul, for how then could it be called, and most truly called, better than the body? But it is not yet called a good soul for this reason, because an act of the will still remains to be made, by which it may become more excellent; should it neglect this, then it is justly blamed, and it is rightly said not to be a good soul.

Such a soul is different from one that has made itself good; and if the latter is deserving of praise, then the former is naturally deserving of blame for not having done so. But when it acts with this end in view and becomes a good soul, it can only reach this goal by turning towards something which itself is not. But to what else can it turn in order to become a good soul, than to the good which it loves, desires, and obtains? And if it should again turn away from it, and by the very fact of its turning away from the good does not become good, then unless that good remain in it from which it has turned away, there would be nothing to which it could again turn if it should wish to amend.

(5) There would, therefore, be no changeable goods, unless there were an unchangeable good. When you hear then of this good and that good which may not even be good in other respects, if it were possible to put aside those goods which are good by a participation in the good and see the good itself of which they are good by participation – for when you

[9] Augustine's reasoning here is very close to the reasoning St. Thomas uses in his "Fourth Way" to prove the existence of God (*Summa Theologiae* 1a, q2, a3).

hear of this or that good, you also understand the good itself at the same time – if, therefore, I repeat, you could put these goods aside and perceive the good in itself, you would see God. And if you cling to Him by love, you will be at once blest. But since other things are not loved unless because they are good, let him be ashamed who is attached to them and does not love the good itself by which they are good. But if that which is also a soul, insofar as it is only a soul – insofar, therefore, as it is not yet good by its turning to the unchangeable good, but as I said, is only a soul – when the soul so pleases us that we also prefer it, when we rightly understand, to every corporeal light, it does not please us in itself, but in that art with which it was made. For there it is approved when already made, where it is seen to have been [in God's eternal plan], when it was still to be made. This is the truth and the simple good, for it is nothing else than good itself, and on this account also the supreme good. For a good cannot be lessened or increased, unless it is a good which is good from another good.

In order to be good, therefore, the soul turns to this good to which it is also indebted for being a soul. Hence, the will then works in harmony with nature when, in order that the soul may be perfected in good, that good is loved by the will turning to it, from which that other good also comes that is not lost even by the turning away of the will. For by turning away from the supreme good, the soul ceases to be a good soul, but it does not cease to be a soul, and even as such it is already a better good than the body. The will, therefore, loses that which the will acquires. For there already was a soul that could wish to be turned to that from which it was, but there wasn't yet a soul that could wish to be before it was. And this is our good, wherein we see whether the thing ought to have been or ought to be, insofar as we comprehend whatever ought to have been or ought to be; and wherein we see that the thing could not have been, unless it ought to have been, although at the same time we do not even comprehend in what manner it ought to have been. This good is not far from any one of us, for "In him we live and move and have our being" [*Acts* 17:27].

Chapter 4

(6) We must remain in this [good] and cling to it by love, that we may enjoy the presence of that from which we are, in the absence of which we would not be at all. For, since "we walk by faith, not by sight" [*2 Corinthians* 5:7], we certainly do not yet see God, as the same one has said, "face to face"

[*1 Corinthians* 13:12]. Unless we love Him now, we shall never see Him. But who loves that which he does not know? For something can be known and not loved; but what I am asking is whether something can be loved that is not known? If that is impossible, then no one loves God before he knows Him. And what does it mean to love God, except to see Him and to perceive Him steadfastly with our mind? For He is not a body to be sought for with bodily eyes.

But even before we are capable of seeing and perceiving God, as He can be perceived, which is granted to the clean of heart, for "blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God" [*Matthew* 5:8], He must be loved by faith; otherwise, the heart cannot be cleansed so as to be fit and ready to see Him. For where are those three, faith, hope, and charity [*1 Corinthians* 13:13], for the building up of which in the soul all the divine books have been composed and work together, except in the soul that believes what it does not yet see, and hopes for and loves what it believes? Therefore, even He who is not known, but in whom one believes, is already loved. Care must, of course, be taken lest the mind, in believing what it does not see, picture it to itself as something which it is not, and so hope for and love that which is false. For if this is done, it will no longer be charity from a pure heart and a good conscience and faith unfeigned which, as the same Apostle says, is the end of the commandment [*1 Timothy* 1:5].

(7) When we believe in any corporeal things, of which we have heard or read but have not seen, our mind must represent them to itself as something with bodily features and forms, just as it occurs to our thoughts; now this image is either false or true; even if it is true, and this can happen very rarely, still we derive no profit from clinging to it by faith, but it is useful for some other purpose which is intimated by means of it. For who, upon reading or listening to the writings of Paul the Apostle, or of those which have been written about him, does not draw a picture in his mind of the countenance of the Apostle himself, and of all those whose names are there mentioned? And since in the large number of people to whom those writings are known, one represents the features and figures of those bodies in one way, and another in a different way, it is assuredly uncertain whose thoughts are closer to and more like the reality. But our faith is not busied there with the bodily countenance of those men, but only with the life that they led through the grace of God, and with the deeds to which that Scripture bears witness; this it is which is useful to believe, which must not be despaired of, and which must be sought.

Even the countenance of the Lord Himself in the flesh is represented differently by reason of the diversity of innumerable thoughts, even though it was only one, whichever it was. But in our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, it is not the image which the mind forms for itself and which may perhaps be far different from what it actually was that leads to salvation, but what we think of the man according to his kind. For an idea has been impressed upon human nature as if it were a law, according to which, when we see any such thing, we at once recognize it as a man or as the form of a man.

Chapter 5

Our thought is formed in accordance with this idea when we believe that God was made man for us, as an example of humility and to manifest God's love for us. For it profits us to believe, and to keep firmly and unshakenly in our heart, that the humility, whereby God was born of a woman and was led through such great insults to His death by mortal men, is the most excellent medicine by which the swelling of our pride may be cured, and the exalted mystery by which the chain of sin may be broken.

Thus it is with regard to the omnipotent God: since we know what omnipotence is, we also believe in the power of His miracles and of His Resurrection, and we form concepts about events of this kind in accordance with the species and genera of things, which are either ingrafted in our nature or are acquired by experience, so that our faith may not be feigned.

Neither do we know the outward appearance of the Virgin Mary, of whom without contact with man or without detriment in the birth itself He was born in a wondrous manner. Nor have we seen what were the characteristic features of the body of Lazarus, nor Bethany, nor the sepulchre, nor the stone which He ordered to be removed when He raised him from the dead, nor the new tomb hewn out of the rock from which He Himself rose, nor Mount Olivet whence He ascended to heaven; and those of us who have never seen these things do not even know whether they were as we imagine them to be; in fact we regard it as more probable that they were not so.

If the look of some place, or of a man, or of any body whatsoever shall appear the same to our eyes as it appeared to our mind when we were thinking

about it before we had seen it, we are moved with no little amazement, for such a thing rarely or hardly ever occurs; and yet we believe those things most firmly, because we reason about them in accordance with the special or general knowledge of which we are certain. For we believe that our Lord Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin called "Mary." But we do not believe, we simply know, what a virgin is, what it is to be born, and what a proper name is. However, whether that was the outward appearance of Mary that came to our mind when we said or recalled these things, we do not at all know, nor do we believe it so. Here, then, it is permissible to say without violating the faith that perhaps she had such an appearance and perhaps she did not have such an appearance; no one, however, without violating the Christian faith could say concerning whether Christ was born of a Virgin, "Perhaps."

(8) Wherefore, we desire to understand the eternity, the equality, and the unity of the Trinity, insofar as it is granted to us; but we must believe before we understand,[10] and be on our guard that our faith may not be feigned, for we must find our enjoyment in this same Trinity in order to live blessedly. But should we believe anything false concerning it, our hope will be vain and our love will not be pure; how, then, by believing can we love that Trinity which we do not know? Will it be according to some special or general knowledge, such as that whereby we love the Apostle Paul? Even if he did not have the outward appearance which comes before us when we think of him, and we are wholly in the dark about this matter, yet we do know what a man is. But we do not even need to go so far, for we ourselves are men. It is evident that he was also a man, that his soul was united with his body, and that he led a mortal life. We believe of him, therefore, what we find in ourselves, along with the species and genus of which every human nature is likewise comprised.

What then? Do we either have a special or a general knowledge of that exalted Trinity, as if there were many such trinities, some of which we have come to know from experience, so that from the law of similarity impressed upon us, either as a special or as a general knowledge, we may also believe that Trinity to be such, and so may love the thing which we believe and yet do not know, from its similarity with the thing which we do know? Such is certainly not the case. Or is it possible for us to believe in and to love the Trinity, which we do not see and the like of which we

[10] Again, faith is in search of understanding.

have never seen, in the same way as we love in the Lord Jesus Christ, that He rose from the dead, although we have never seen anyone rise from the dead? But we certainly know what it is to die, and what it is to live, because we both live and at times have seen and learned from experience about the dead and the dying. But to rise again, what else is it, if not to live again, that is, to return from death to life?

When we, therefore, speak of and believe in the Trinity, we know what a trinity is, because we know what three are. But this is not what we love. For we can easily have it whenever we wish – to pass over other things – by simply raising three fingers. Or is it that we do not love every trinity, but only that which is God the Trinity? What we love in the Trinity, therefore, is that it is God; but we have not seen, nor do we know of any other God, since there is only one God, that one whom we have not seen and whom we love by believing. But the question here is, by what likeness or comparison with known things can we believe, so that we may also love the God who is not yet known?

Chapter 6

(9) Return, therefore, with me, and let us consider why we love the Apostle. Is it on account of his human form which is most familiar to us, because we believe him to have been a man? Certainly not; otherwise, we would have no reason for loving him now, since he is no longer that man, for his soul has been separated from his body. But we believe that what we love in him lives even now, for we love his just soul [or mind, *animus*[11]]. And by reason of what general or special law then except this, that we know what a soul [*animus*] is and what a just man is. And as regards the soul [*animus*], we not unfittingly say that we, therefore, know what a soul [*animus*] is because we also have a soul [*animus*]. We have never seen it with our eyes, nor formed a general or special idea of it from any similarity with other souls that we have seen, but rather, as I said, because we, too, have a soul

[11] In view of the argumentation coming up, it is especially important to keep in mind that Augustine has two words for "soul," the feminine word, *anima*, and the masculine word, *animus*. As mentioned in note 8, Augustine uses *anima* for the rational principle of all living things, including human beings. But the *anima* that human beings have, in his view, is a rational *anima*, that is, an *animus*, or mind. In the Argument from Analogy for Other Minds that Augustine is about to present, he supposes we use reason to justify our belief that there is an *animus*, a mind, in another human being. But he supposes that some beasts, with only an *anima*, instinctually do something that is somehow functionally equivalent to reasoning analogically to the supposition that there are other minds, or souls.

[*animus*]. For what is so intimately known, and what knows itself to be itself, than that through which all other things are likewise known, that is, the soul [*animus*][12] itself?

For we also recognize, from a likeness to us, the movements of bodies by which we perceive that others besides us live. Just as we move our body in living, so, we notice, those bodies are moved. For when a living body is moved, there is no way opened to our eyes to see the soul [*animus*], a thing which cannot be seen with the eyes. But we perceive something present in that bulk, such as is present in us to move our bulk in a similar way; it is life and the soul [*anima*]. Nor is such perception something peculiar to, as it were, human prudence and reason. For indeed beasts perceive as living, not only themselves, but also each other and one another, and us as well. Nor do they see our souls [*animas*[13]] except through the movements of our bodies, and that at once and very easily by a sort of natural agreement.[14] Therefore, we know the mind [*animus*] of anyone at all from our own, and from our own case we believe in that which we do not know. For not only do we perceive a mind [*animus*], but we even know what one is, by considering our own; for we, too, have a mind [*animus*].

But from what do we know what the just person is? For we have said that we love the Apostle for no other reason than that he is a just soul [*animus*]. So then we know what a just person is, as we also know what a soul [*animus*] is. But we know what a soul [*animus*] is, as has been said, from ourselves, for there is a soul [*animus*] within us. But from what do we know what the just person is if we are not just? For if no one knows what the just person is except one who is himself just, then no one loves the just person except a just person. For no one can love one whom he believes to be just, merely for this reason that he believes him to be just, if he does not know what it is to be just. This follows from what we have shown above, namely, that no one loves what he believes and does not see, except by virtue of some law based on general or special knowledge. And, consequently, if no one loves the just person except a just person, how can anyone who is not yet just will to become just? For no one wills to be that which he does not love. But in order that one who is not yet just may

12 Augustine makes the same claim about *mens*, mind, throughout Book 10. It is clear that each occurrence of *animus* here in this chapter, and perhaps throughout Book 8, could as well be translated "mind."

13 That is, the accusative plural of *anima*.

14 *quadam conspiratione naturale*. Augustine's idea seems to be that beasts do instinctively, without reasoning, something human beings do through analogical reasoning.

become so, let him by all means will to be just; but in order that he may have such a will, he must love the just person. Therefore, even he who is not yet just loves the just person. But one who does not know what a just person is cannot love the just person. Consequently, even he who is not yet just knows what the just person is.

From what does he know this? Does he see it with his eyes? Is there a just body, as there is a white, black, square, or round body? Who has ever said such a thing? One sees nothing with the eyes except bodies. But there is nothing just in a man except the soul, and when one is called just, he is so called by reason of his soul, not his body. For justice is a certain beauty of the soul through which men are beautiful, even though the body of very many is misshapen and deformed. But even as the soul is not seen by the eyes, so neither is its beauty. From what then does one who is not yet just know what the just person is, and love the just person in order to become just himself? Are certain signs flashed through the movement of the body by which this or that person appears to be just? But whence does he know that these are the signs of a just soul if he has no idea at all of what the just soul is? Therefore, he does know.

But from what do we know what the just person is, even when we are not yet just? If we know it from outside ourselves, we know it in some body. But this is not a thing of the body. Therefore, we know what the just person is from within ourselves. For I do not find it anywhere else when I seek to utter it, except within myself; and if I ask another what the just person is, he seeks for what he should answer within himself, and, therefore, whoever could answer truly has found what to answer within himself.

In fact when I wish to speak of Carthage, I seek for what to say within myself, and find an image of Carthage within myself; but I received this through the body, that is, through the sense of the body, since I was present there in the body, and have seen and perceived it with my senses, and have retained it in my memory, that I might find the word about it within myself whenever I might wish to utter it. For its image [*phantasia*] in my mind is its word, not that sound of three syllables ["Car-tha-go"] when Carthage is named, or even when that name itself is silently thought of during some period of time, but the word that I see in my mind when I utter this word of three syllables with my voice, or even before I utter it.

So too, when I wish to speak of Alexandria, which I have never seen, an image [*imago*] of it is also present within me. For I had heard from

many people and believed that it is a great city; so in accordance with the description that could be given me, I formed an image of it in my mind as I was able; and this is its word within me, when I wish to express it, before my voice utters the five syllables that make the name almost everyone knows. And if I could bring this image from my mind before the eyes of the people who are familiar with Alexandria, all would doubtless say either, "That is not it," or if they were to say, "That is it," I would be much surprised; and while I gazed upon it in my mind, that is, upon the image as if it were a picture of it, yet I should not know if it were so, but I would believe those who had seen it and retained the image of what they had seen.

But I do not seek in that way for what the just person is, nor do I so find it, nor so gaze upon it when I utter it, nor am I so approved when I am heard, nor do I so approve when I hear, as if I had seen such a thing with my eyes, or had learned of it from any sense of my body, or had heard it from those who had so learned it. For when I say, and say as one who knows, "A soul is just which with knowledge and deliberation both in life and conduct assigns to everyone his due," I do not think of something absent as Carthage, or imagine it as I can as Alexandria, whether it be so or not; but I see something present and see it within me, even though I myself am not that which I see, and many will agree with me if they hear what I see. And whoever hears me and gives his approval as one who knows, he himself also sees this same thing in himself, even though he himself is also not that which he sees. But when the just person says this, then he sees and says what he himself is. And where does he himself also see it except within himself? But this is not wonderful. For where then should he see himself, if not within himself? The marvel is that the soul should see within itself what it has not seen anywhere else, and should see truly, and should see the truly just soul itself, and that itself is indeed a soul, and yet not the just soul that it sees within itself.

Is there perhaps another just soul in the soul that is not yet just? Or if there is not, what does it see there when it sees and says what a just soul is, nor see anywhere else than in itself, even though it itself is not a just soul? Is that which it sees an inner truth which is present to the soul that is capable of seeing it? Not all are capable of doing so, and not all who are capable of seeing it are also that which they behold, that is, they themselves are not also just souls; but they can see and say what a just soul is. And in what other way will they be able to be so, save by clinging

to that same form itself which they behold, in order that they may be formed by it and be good souls? Then they will not only see and say what a just soul is, namely, one that with knowledge and deliberation both in life and conduct assigns to everyone his due, but they themselves will also live justly and be rooted in justice by assigning to everyone his due, so that they may owe no man anything except to love one another.

And how does one cling to that form save by loving it? Why, then, do we love another whom we believe to be just, and not love that form itself in which we see what a just soul is, so that we too may be able to be just? Or should we not rather say that unless we also loved that form, we should not love him at all whom we love through it, but while we are not just, we love it too little and so are unable to become just? The man, therefore, who is believed to be just, is loved through that form and truth which he who loves, sees, and understands within himself. But this form and truth cannot be loved from anywhere else. For we find nothing similar to it outside of itself, so that by believing we might love it when it is unknown, by reason of something similar that we already know. For whatever thing of this kind one may have seen is itself, and there is nothing else of the kind, since itself alone is such as itself is.

He, therefore, who loves men ought to love them, either because they are just or that they may be just. So ought he to love himself also, either because he is just or that he may be just, for in this way he loves his neighbor as himself without any danger. For he who loves himself otherwise, loves himself unjustly, since he loves himself for this purpose that he may be unjust; he loves himself, therefore, that he may be wicked, and consequently he no longer loves himself, since "he who loves iniquity hates his own soul" [*Psalm* 10:6].

Chapter 7

(10) Therefore, in this question concerning the Trinity and the knowledge of God, nothing else is to be particularly considered, except what true love is, or rather, what love is. For only true love may be called love, otherwise it is desire. Therefore, it is a misuse of terms to say of those who desire that they love, just as it is a misuse of terms to say of those who love that they desire. But this is true love, that while holding fast to the truth, we may live justly, and, therefore, may despise everything mortal for the sake of the love of men, whereby we wish them to live justly.

For in this way we can be prepared even to die with profit for our brethren, which the Lord Jesus Christ has taught us by His example. For since the whole Law and the Prophets depend on these two commandments, love of God and love of neighbor [*Matthew* 22:37–40], it is not without reason that Scripture generally places one for both. At times it mentions only the love of God, as in this passage: "We know that for those who love God all things work together unto good" [*Romans* 8:28], and again: "But whoever loves God, he is known by him" [*1 Corinthians* 8:3], and again: "Because the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us" [*Romans* 5:5] and so on in many other texts. For he who loves God must logically do what God has commanded, and loves Him just as much as he does so; therefore, he must also love his neighbor since God has commanded this.

At other times Scripture mentions only the love of our neighbor, as in that text: "Bear one another's burden, and so you will fulfill the law of Christ" [*Galatians* 6:2] and again: "For the whole Law is fulfilled in one word, in that which is written, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself'" [*Galatians* 5:14], and in the Gospel: "All that you wish men to do to you, even so do you also to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets" [*Matthew* 7:12]. And we find many other passages in the Sacred Scriptures where love of our neighbor alone seems to be commanded for perfection, and the love of God is passed over in silence, although the Law and the Prophets depend on both commandments. But this also follows logically, for he who loves his neighbor must also love love itself above everything else. But "God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God" [*John* 4:16]. Therefore, he must needs love God above everything else.

(11) Consequently, those who seek God by those powers that rule the world, or parts of the world, are taken away and cast far from Him, not by intervals of space but by diversity of affections, for they seek to walk by outward paths, and abandon their own interior things, interior to which is God. Therefore, even though they may have heard or thought in one way or another of some holy, heavenly power, they are more desirous of its deeds at which human weakness marvels, but do not imitate the piety by which rest in God is secured. For they prefer in their pride to be able to do what an angel can, rather than to be by their piety what an angel is. For no holy person rejoices in his own power, but in the power of Him from whom he has whatever power he can suitably have. He knows that it is a proof of greater power to be united with the omnipotent One by a

pious will, rather than to be able to do things by his own power and will, at which those tremble who cannot do such things.

Therefore, while doing such things the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, in order to teach greater things to the astonished spectators, and to turn those who were eager for and dependent upon these unusual things to eternal and interior things, said: "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you" [*Matthew* 11:28]. And He did not say: "Learn from me, because I raise up those who are dead for four days," but "Learn from me, because I am meek and humble of heart" [*Matthew* 11:29]. For humility that is solidly established is more powerful and safer than the most inflated conceit. And, therefore, He proceeds to say: "You will find rest for your souls" [*Matthew* 11:29]. For "Charity is not puffed up" [*1 Corinthians* 13:4], and "God is love" [*1 John* 4:8], and "The faithful in love shall rest in him" [*Wisdom* 3:9], called back from the clamor that is without to silent joys. Behold, "God is love." Why then do we set out for and run to the heights of the heavens and to the depths of the earth in search of Him who is within us, if we wish to be with Him?

Chapter 8

(12) Let no one say: "I do not know what I should love." Let him love his brother and he will love the same love. For he knows the love by which he loves more than the brother whom he loves. And so, God can now become more known to him than his brother, actually more known because more present, more known because more within him, more known because more certain. Embrace love, God, and embrace God by love. It is love itself which unites all the good angels and all the servants of God by the bond of holiness, and unites us and them mutually with ourselves and makes us subject to Himself. Therefore, the more we are cured of the swelling of pride, the more we are full of love, and of what, if not of God, is he full who is full of love?

One may object: "I see love and I conceive it in my mind as best I can, and I believe the Scripture when it says: 'God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God,' but when I see it I do not see the Trinity in it." But as a matter of fact you do see the Trinity if you see love. But I will give you a proof, if I can, so that you may see that you do see the Trinity; only let love itself be present that we may be moved by it to something good. For when we love love, then we love that which loves something,

precisely because it loves something. What, therefore, does love love, that love itself may also be loved? For that which loves nothing is not love. But if it loves itself, it must love something in order that it may love itself as love. For, just as a word both indicates something and also indicates itself, but it does not indicate itself as a word, unless it indicates that it is indicating something, so, too, does love indeed love itself; but unless it loves itself as loving something, then it does not love itself as love. What, therefore, does love love, except that which we love with love?

But this, to begin with what is nearest to us, is our brother. Let us take note of how highly the Apostle John commends brotherly love: "He who loves his brother," he says, "abides in the light, and there is no scandal in him" [*1 John* 2:12]. It is evident that he has put the perfection of justice in brotherly love, for he in whom there is no scandal is surely perfect, and yet it seems that he has kept silent about the love of God. He would never have done so if he did not intend that God should be understood in brotherly love itself. For a little later on in the same Epistle he expresses this most plainly in the following words: "Beloved, let us love one another, because love is from God. And everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. He who does not love, does not know God, for God is love" [*1 John* 1:5]. The context shows sufficiently and clearly that brotherly love itself (for brotherly love is that whereby we love one another) is taught by so eminent an authority, not only to be from God, but also to be God.

Therefore, when we love our brother from love, we love our brother from God; nor can it happen that we do not love above all else that same love by which we love our brother. From this we conclude that these two commandments cannot be without one another. For since "God is love," he who loves love, surely loves God; but he must needs love love who loves his brother. And, therefore, he says a little later: "He cannot love God whom he does not see, who does not love his brother whom he sees" [*1 John* 4:7–8, 20]. That he does not love his brother is indeed the reason why he does not see God. For he who does not love his brother is not in love; and he who is not in love is not in God, because God is love.

Furthermore, he who is not in God is not in the light, because "God is light and in him is no darkness" [*1 John* 1:5]. If anyone, therefore, is not in the light, what wonder is it if he does not see the light, that is, if he does not see God, because he is in darkness? But he sees his brother with the human sight by which God cannot be seen. If, however, he loved him whom he sees by human sight with a spiritual love, he would see God,

who is love itself, with that inner sight by which He can be seen. How then can he, who does not love his brother whom he sees, love God whom he, therefore, does not see, since God is love, and this is wanting to him who does not love his brother? Neither should we let this other question disturb us, how much love we ought to spend upon our brother, how much upon God – incomparably more upon God than upon ourselves, but as much upon our brother as upon ourselves – and we love ourselves so much the more, the more we love God. We, therefore, love God and our neighbor from one and the same love, but we love God on account of God, but ourselves and our neighbor on account of God.

Chapter 9

(13) What is the reason, pray, why we are inflamed when we read and hear: "Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation. Giving no offense to anyone, that our ministry may not be blamed; but in everything commending ourselves as God's ministers, in much patience; in tribulations, in hardships, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in sleepless nights, in fastings; in chastity, in knowledge, in long-suffering; in kindness, in the Holy Spirit, in charity unfeigned, in the word of truth, in the power of God; with the armor of justice on the right hand and on the left; in honor and dishonor, in evil report and good report; as deceivers and yet truthful; as unknown and yet known; as dying and behold we live; as chastised and not killed; as sorrowful yet always rejoicing; as poor yet enriching many; as having nothing yet possessing all things"? [*2 Corinthians* 6:2–10]

Why is it that we are enkindled with love for the Apostle Paul when we read these words, unless we believe that he so lived? Yet we believe that the ministers of God should so live, not because we hear it from some others, but because we see it within ourselves, or rather above ourselves in the truth itself. Therefore, it is from this which we see that we love him whom we believe to have lived in the same way. And unless we loved this form above all else, which we perceived to be always immovable and unchangeable, we should not, therefore, love him, because we retain in our faith that his life, while he lived on earth, harmonized with, and corresponded to, this form.

I know not how, but we are inspired the more to the love of this form through the faith by which we believe someone to have so lived, and to

the hope whereby we do not at all despair that we can so live – we who are men, from the fact that some men have so lived – so that we desire it more ardently and pray for it more fervently. Thus the love for this form, according to which they are believed to have lived, causes us to love the life of these men; and their life thus believed arouses a more fervent love for this same form. Therefore, the more ardently we love God, so much the more certainly and calmly do we see Him, because we see the unchangeable form of justice in God, and we judge that men ought to live in conformity with it. Faith is, therefore, a powerful help to the knowledge and the love of God, not as though He were wholly unknown or wholly unloved, but that He may be known more clearly, and that He may be loved more fervently.

Chapter 10

(14) But what is love or charity, which the Divine Scripture praises and proclaims so highly, if not the love of the good? Now love is of someone who loves, and something is loved with love. So then there are three: the lover, the beloved, and the love.[15] What else is love, therefore, except a kind of life which binds or seeks to bind some two together, namely, the lover and the beloved? And this is so even in external and carnal love. But that we may draw from a purer and clearer source, let us tread the flesh under foot and mount up to the soul. What does the soul love in a friend except the soul? And, therefore, even here there are three: the lover, the beloved, and the love.

It remains to ascend even from here and to seek for those higher things, insofar as it is granted to man. But let our purpose rest here a while, not that it may think to have already found that which it is seeking, but as a place is usually found where something is to be sought; what is sought has not yet been found, but the place has now been found where it is to be sought. So it will have sufficed to have said this, so that from it, as if from a small portion of some beginning, we may weave the rest of our discourse.

[15] This trinity of love, lover, and beloved, is the first of a series of "psychological" trinities Augustine uses to illuminate the Divine Trinity. Thus, as Augustine writes in the next paragraph, "what is sought has not yet been found, but the place has now been found where it is to be sought."

Book 9

Outline

1. Let us resolve again to try to understand the Doctrine of the Trinity. (1.10)
2. Consider the three things: lover, beloved, and love. (2.2)
3. When the mind loves itself there is this trinity: mind, love, and knowledge [of itself]. (3.3–4.4)
4. When the mind loves itself, love and knowledge of itself are not mere parts of it. (4.5–7)
5. In that case mind, love, and knowledge are each in the other two, yet each is a substance. (5.8)
6. Having seen in our own mind some body or some place, we can recognize its form or type. (6.9–11)
7. We do willingly with our bodies only what we have previously formulated in mental language. (7.12)
8. One who knows and loves justice perfectly is just before doing any just deeds. (8.13–9.14)
9. We must distinguish between words of a natural language, even as thought, and mental words. (10.15)
10. Knowing itself, the mind begets knowledge of itself that is like itself and equal to itself. (11.16–12.18)
11. The mind, its knowledge of itself, and its love of itself are an image of the Divine Trinity. (12.18)

Chapter 1

We are indeed seeking a trinity, though not just any trinity at all, but that Trinity which is God, and the true, the supreme, and the only God.

Keep waiting, therefore, you, whoever you are, who hear these words. For we are still seeking, and no one rightly faults searching for such things, provided only that the searcher remain firmly rooted in the faith while he seeks that which it is so difficult to know or to express.[1]

To be sure, whoever sees or teaches better may quickly and justly find fault with a dogmatic statement. "Seek God," it says, "and your soul shall live" [*Psalm* 68:33]. And that no one might rejoice rashly, as though he had apprehended Him, it says: "Seek his face evermore" [*Psalm* 105:4]. And the Apostle says: "If anyone thinks that he knows anything, he does not yet know as he ought to know. But if anyone loves God, the same is known by him" [*1 Corinthians* 8:2–3]. He certainly did not express it in this way: "He knew him," for that would be a dangerous presumption, but "he is known by him." In another place, too, when he had spoken as follows: "But now you know God," he immediately corrected himself: "or rather you are known by God" [*Galatians* 4:9]. And above all, in a well-known passage he says: "Brethren, I do not consider that I myself have laid hold of this. But one thing I do: forgetting what is behind, I strain forward to what is before. I press on in purpose towards the goal of God's heavenly call in Christ Jesus. Let us then, as many as are perfect, be of this mind" [*Philemon* 3:13–15].

He says that perfection in this life is to forget what is behind, and to press forward purposefully towards the goal that lies before us. For the safest purpose for him who seeks is to continue seeking until he has laid hold of that towards which we tend and for which we are striving. But the right purpose is that which proceeds from faith. For a certain faith is in some way the beginning of knowledge, but a certain knowledge will only be perfected after this life when we shall see face to face [*1 Corinthians* 13:12]. Let us then be of this mind: so as to know that the inclination to seek the truth is safer than the presumption which regards unknown things as known. Let us, therefore, so seek as if we were about to find, and so find as if we were about to seek. For "when a man has done, then he begins" [*Ecclesiasticus* 18.6].

Let us not doubt faithlessly the things to be believed, and let us affirm without rashness the things to be understood; in the former case, authority is to be upheld; in the latter, the truth is to be sought. With regard to the question at hand, therefore, let us believe that the Father, the Son, and

[1] This is another expression of Augustine's motto, "faith in search of understanding."

the Holy Spirit are one God, the Creator, and the ruler of all creation; that the Father is not the Son, nor is the Holy Spirit the Father or the Son, but that there is a trinity of inter-related persons, and the unity of an equal substance.[2]

But let us seek to understand this, imploring the help of Him whom we wish to understand; and in the measure that He shall grant, desiring to explain what we understand, with such pious care and solicitude, that even if we should say one thing for another, we may yet say nothing that is unworthy of Him. For example, if we say something of the Father, which in the strict sense is not suitable to the Father, that it may at least be suitable to the Son, or to the Holy Spirit, or to the Trinity itself; and if we say anything of the Son, which does not properly belong to the Son, that it may at least belong to the Father, or to the Holy Spirit, or to the Trinity; and likewise if we say anything about the Holy Spirit, which may not be fittingly called a property of His, that it may, nevertheless, not be alien from the Father, or the Son, or from the one God, the Trinity itself.

We are now eager to see whether that most excellent love is proper to the Holy Spirit, and if it is not so, whether the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Trinity itself is love, since we cannot contradict the most certain faith and the most weighty authority of Scripture which says: "God is love" [*1 John* 4:16]. Nevertheless, we should not be guilty of the sacrilegious error of attributing to the Trinity that which does not belong to the Creator, but rather to the creature, or is imagined by mere empty thought.

Chapter 2

(2) Since this is the case, let us fix our attention on these three things which we seem to have discovered. We are not yet speaking of heavenly things, not yet of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, but of this imperfect image, which is an image nevertheless, that is, of man. For the weakness of our mind[3] perhaps gazes upon the image more familiarly and more easily.[4]

Behold, when I, who conduct this inquiry, love something, then three things are found: I, what I love, and the love itself. For I do not love love, unless I love a lover, for there is no love where nothing is loved. There are,

[2] Or essence, *essentia*.

[3] *mens.* From this point on Augustine focuses on the mind, *mens*, rather than the rational soul, *animus*.

[4] Augustine here alludes to the rationale for the overall project that occupies him throughout DT 8–15, that is, the project of illuminating the Divine Trinity by finding mental or psychological triads that reflect God's three-in-oneness.

therefore, three things: the lover, the beloved, and the love. But what if I love only myself? In that case will there be only two, what I love and the love? For the lover and the beloved are one and the same when one loves oneself, just as to love and to be loved are one and the same when one loves oneself. For the same thing is said twice when it is said, he loves himself, and he is loved by himself. For here to love is not one thing, and to be loved another thing, just as the lover is not one person and the beloved another person. But yet even so, the love and the beloved are two. For whoever loves himself is not love, except when love itself is loved. But it is one thing to love oneself and another thing to love one's love. For love is not loved unless as already loving something; for where nothing is loved, there is no love. Hence, when anyone loves himself there are two: the love and what is loved; for here the lover and the beloved are one. It does not seem to follow, therefore, that wherever there is love, three things must be understood.

Let us not consider in this inquiry the many other things of which a man is composed. That we may clearly discover what we are now seeking, insofar as we can discover anything at all in these questions, let us confine the discussion to the mind [*mens*] alone.

When the mind, then, loves itself it makes known two things: the mind and the love. But what does "to love oneself" mean, other than to desire to help oneself to enjoy oneself? And when one wishes oneself to be exactly as much as he is, then the will is equal to the mind, and the love is equal to the lover. And if love is a substance, it is certainly not body but spirit; the mind is not body but spirit. Yet love and mind are not two spirits, but one spirit; not two essences, but one essence; and still the two are one, the lover and the love, or, so to say, the beloved and the love. And these two are truly said to be mutually related. The lover is referred to the love and the love to the lover. For the lover loves with some love, and love is of someone who loves.

Mind and spirit are not spoken of relatively, but denote essence.[5] For it is not that because there is a mind and spirit of some particular man, therefore mind and spirit exist. Even if we take away the body from what is a man, which he is called with the addition of the body, the mind and the spirit still remain; but if you take away the lover, there is no love; and

[5] Or substance, *essentia*. Augustine is here appealing to substantial predication, one of the two modes of proper predication he identifies in Book 5 (at 5.6). The other mode of proper predication he recognizes is relative predication.

if you take away the love, there is no lover. Insofar, therefore, as they are mutually related, they are two; but when they are spoken of in respect to themselves, each is spirit, and both together are one spirit; and each is mind and both together are one mind. Where, then, is the Trinity? Let us concentrate as much as we can, and call upon the everlasting light to enlighten our darkness, so that we may see the image of God in ourselves, insofar as we are permitted.

Chapter 3

(3) The mind cannot love itself unless it also knows itself, for how can it love what it does not know? Or if anyone says that the mind by general or special knowledge believes that it is such as he knows from experience that others are, he is speaking in a very foolish manner. For from what does a mind know another mind if it does not know itself?[6] For not as the eye of the body sees other eyes and does not see itself, so does the mind know other minds and does not know itself. For we see bodies through the eyes of the body, because we cannot refract the rays which shine through them and touch whatever we see, and reflect them back into the eyes themselves, except when we are looking into a mirror. But this is a subject that is discussed very subtly and very obscurely, until it can be clearly shown whether it is actually so, or whether it is not so.

But whatever may be the nature of the power by which we see through the eyes, we certainly do not see the power itself, whether it be rays or anything else, with the eyes, but we seek it in the mind; and if it is possible, we also comprehend it in the mind. As the mind itself, therefore, gathers the knowledge of corporeal things through the bodily senses, so it gains the knowledge of incorporeal things through itself, since it is incorporeal. For if it does not know itself, it does not love itself.

Chapter 4

(4) But just as there are two things, the mind and its love, when it loves itself, so there are two things, the mind and its knowledge,[7] when it knows itself. Therefore, the mind itself, its love and its knowledge are a kind of

[6] Augustine here alludes to the reasoning he had developed more fully in the previous book (DT 8.6.9), according to which the mind knows itself by its immediate presence to itself and knows that there are other minds only by analogical reasoning.

[7] *notitia*.

trinity;[8] these three are one, and when they are perfect they are equal. For if anyone loves himself less than he is – if, for example, the mind of man loves itself as much as the body of man is to be loved, whereas the mind is more than the body – he is guilty of sin and his love is not perfect. Similarly, if he loves himself more than he is – if, for example, he loves himself as much as God is to be loved, whereas he is incomparably less than God – he also sins by excess and does not have a perfect love of himself. But he sins with greater perversity and malice when he loves the body as much as God is to be loved.

His knowledge, likewise, is not perfect if it is less than the object known, when this is fully knowable. But if it is greater, then the nature which knows is superior to that which is known, just as the knowledge of the body is greater than the body itself which is known by that knowledge. For knowledge is a kind of life in the understanding of one who knows; but the body is not life. And any life is greater than any body, not in bulk but in power. But when the mind knows itself, its knowledge does not surpass it, because itself knows and itself is known. When the mind, therefore, knows itself fully and nothing else with itself, then its knowledge is equal to it, because its knowledge is not from another nature when it knows itself.[9] And when it perceives itself fully and nothing more, then its knowledge is neither less nor greater than itself. We have, therefore, rightly said that when these three are perfect, they are necessarily equal.

(5) We are also reminded at the same time, if we can in any way visualize it, that these [two things, knowledge and love] exist in the soul; they are, so to speak, so folded within it that, when unfolded, they are perceived to be numbered substantially, or, what is the same thing, essentially.[10] They are not in the soul as in a subject, as color, or shape, or any other quality or quantity are in the body. For nothing of this kind extends beyond the subject in which it is. Thus the color or the shape of this body cannot be the color or the shape of another body.[11] But the mind can

[8] This is the second mental or psychological trinity Augustine offers in his continuing attempt to illuminate the Divine Trinity.

[9] It follows from Augustine's reasoning here that the mind can know itself non-referentially and without having to represent itself to itself.

[10] Augustine had remarked in Book 5 that, in philosophical Latin, there is no generally accepted distinction between *substantia* and *essentia*.

[11] Augustine here subscribes to the idea that there are non-substantial particulars, that is, non-repeatable instances of a shade of color or specific shape. In recent philosophy such particulars are called, following the terminology of D. C. Williams, "tropes."

also love something else besides itself by the same love by which it loves itself.

Similarly, the mind does not know itself alone, but also many other things. Therefore, love and knowledge are not in the mind as in a subject, but they are also there substantially as the mind itself is. For even though they are spoken of as mutually related, yet each is there in its own substance. Nor is the relationship that we predicate of them the same as that of color and a colored subject. For color is in a colored subject, but does not have its own proper substance in itself, for the colored body is the substance, but the color is in the substance; the relationship is rather that of two friends, who are also men, which are substances; since they are not said to be men relatively, but friends relatively.

(6) Moreover, although the one who loves or knows is a substance, and love is a substance, and knowledge is a substance, but the lover and the love, or the knower and the knowledge, are spoken of in relation to each other as are friends; yet mind or spirit are not relative terms, as men are not; in spite of this, the lover and the love, and the knower and the knowledge, cannot be separated from each other as men can be who are friends. Although it seems that friends can also be separated from each other in body, but not in mind, inasmuch as they are friends; but it can happen that a friend begins to hate a friend, and thereby ceases to be a friend, while the other does not know this and still loves him.

But if the love by which the mind loves itself ceases to be, then the mind will also cease to love at the same time; likewise, if the knowledge by which the mind knows itself ceases to be, the mind will also cease to know itself at the same time. Just as the head of anything having a head is certainly a head, and they are spoken of in relation to each other, although they are also substances; for the head is a body, as well as that which has a head; and if there is no head, neither will there be that which has a head. But these [i.e., the head and the body] can be separated from each other by a simple cutting off; those [i.e., the head and that which has a head] cannot.

(7) Even if there are some bodies which cannot be separated or divided at all, yet unless they were composed of their own parts they would not be bodies. It is called a part, therefore, in relation to the whole, because every part is a part of some whole, and the whole is a whole by having all of its parts. But since the part as well as the whole is a body, they not only express a relationship, but also possess their own being as substances.

Perhaps the mind, therefore, is a whole, and its parts are, as it were, the love by which it loves itself, and the knowledge by which it knows itself, and from these two parts the whole is composed. Or are there three equal parts which complete that one whole? But no part embraces the whole of which it is a part; but when the mind knows itself as a whole, that is, knows itself perfectly, its knowledge extends through the whole of it; and when it loves itself perfectly, it loves itself as a whole, and its love diffuses itself through the whole of it. Or is it, therefore, that as one drink is made up of wine, water, and honey, each of which is found throughout the whole, and yet there are three (for there is no part of the drink which does not contain these three; they are not joined as if they were water and oil, but are mingled throughout and all are substances, and that whole liquid is one substance composed of three substances); so we are to consider these three, mind, love, and knowledge, as being together in some such way? But the water, the wine, and the honey are not of one substance, although the one substance of the drink is brought about by mixing them together.

But I do not see how these three are not of the same substance, since the mind loves itself and knows itself, and these three so exist that the mind is neither loved by nor known to any other thing. These three, therefore, must necessarily be of one and the same substance, and consequently, if they were mingled together, as it were, in a confused mass, then they would in no way be three, nor could they be mutually related. It is just as if you were to make three similar rings from one and the same gold; although they are connected with one another, yet they are related to one another in that they are similar, for everything similar is similar to something. In this case you have a trinity of rings and one gold. But if they are melted together, and the gold is spread throughout the whole of its own mass, then that trinity will perish and will cease altogether; and not only will it be called one gold, as it was called in the example of the three rings, but now it will not be called a golden trinity.

Chapter 5

(8) But in these three, when the mind knows itself and loves itself, a trinity remains: the mind, love, and knowledge; and there is no confusion through any commingling, although each is a substance in itself, and all are found mutually in all, whether each one in each two, or each two in each one. Consequently, all are in all. For the mind is certainly in itself,

since it is called a mind in respect to itself, although in relation to its knowledge it is spoken of as knowing, as being known, or as knowable; and when referring to the love by which it loves itself, it is also spoken of as loving, as being loved, or as lovable. And knowledge, although it is referred to a mind that either knows or is known, yet in respect to itself it is also spoken of both as known and as knowing, for the knowledge by which the mind itself knows itself is not unknown to itself. And love, although it is referred to the mind that loves, of which it is the love, yet it is likewise love in respect to itself, so that it also exists in itself. For love is also loved, nor can it be loved with anything else except with love, that is, with itself. And so each exists in itself. But they are mutually in each other in such a way that the mind that loves is in the love, and love is in the knowledge of him who loves, and knowledge is in the mind that knows.

And so each one is in each two, because the mind that knows and loves itself is in its own love and knowledge; and the love of the mind that knows and loves itself is in the mind and in its knowledge; and the knowledge of the mind that knows and loves itself is in the mind and in its love; because it loves itself as knowing and knows itself as loving. And for this reason each two are also in each one, because the mind that knows and loves itself is in the love with its knowledge, and in the knowledge with its love, since the love itself and the knowledge are also together in the mind that loves and knows itself. But we have shown above, how all are in all, since the mind loves itself as a whole, and knows itself as a whole, and knows all its love, and loves all its knowledge, when these three are perfect in respect to themselves. These three, therefore, are in a marvelous manner inseparable from one another; and yet each of them is a substance, and all together are one substance or essence, while the terms themselves express a mutual relationship.

Chapter 6

(9) When the human mind, however, knows itself and loves itself, it does not know and love something immutable; each individual man, attentive to what is going on within him, speaks in one way when he expresses his own mind, but defines the human mind in a different way by a special and general knowledge. Therefore, when one speaks to me about his own mind, as to whether he understands or does not understand this or that, and whether he wishes or does not wish this or that, I believe what he says;

but when he speaks the truth about the human mind, either specifically or generally, I recognize the truth and approve.

It is, therefore, obvious that what a person sees in himself is one thing, for another does not see this but believes what the speaker tells him; but what he sees in the truth itself is another thing, for another can also behold the same thing; the former is changeable in time, while the latter remains steadfast in its unchangeable eternity. For it is not by seeing many minds with our bodily eyes that we gather, by their similarity, a general or special knowledge of the human mind;[12] but we contemplate the inviolable truth, whence we can as perfectly as possible define, not what each man's mind is, but what it ought to be in the light of the eternal types.

(10) Whence the images of corporeal things also, which we draw in through the bodily sense and which flow in some way into the memory, and from which things that have not been seen are also presented to the mind under a fancied image, whether it contradicts the reality or by chance agrees with it, are approved or disapproved within ourselves by rules that are wholly different, which remain unchangeably above our mind when we rightly approve or disapprove of anything. Thus, when I call to mind the walls of Carthage, which I have seen, and form an image of those of Alexandria, which I have not seen, and prefer some of these imaginary forms to others, I prefer them for a good reason; the judgment of the truth from above is strong and clear, and remains steadfast by the most incorruptible rules of its own right; and even if it is concealed by bodily images, as by a kind of cloud, still it is not hidden nor confused.

(11) But it does make a difference, whether, while I am under or in that darkness, I am shut off, as it were, from the clear heavens or, as usually happens on the highest mountains, whether I behold the most dazzling light above and the most dense clouds below, while enjoying the free air between both. From where is the flame of brotherly love enkindled in me, when I hear of any man who has suffered bitter torments in defense of the beauty and the strength of the faith? And if this man himself is pointed out to me with the finger, I am eager to be united with him, to make myself known to him, and to bind him to myself in friendship.

[12] That is, I do not come to know what a mind is by abstracting mindedness from its instances around me. Rather, Augustine argues in DT 8.6.9, I know what a mind is from my own case and attribute mindedness to bodily entities around me whose bodily movements I observe are similar to the movements of my own body. But, as Augustine goes on to say here, coming to know what a mind is from my one case includes coming to know in the light of eternal truth not only what a mind is, but also what each mind, including my own, ought to be.

Therefore, if given the opportunity, I approach him, address him, engage him in conversation, express my affection for him in whatever words I can; and in turn I wish that the same affection should be brought about in him and expressed towards me; and since I cannot discern so quickly and investigate his innermost heart thoroughly, I strive after a spiritual embrace in the way of faith. Therefore, I love a faithful and strong man with a chaste and genuine love.

If, in the course of our talk, however, he were to confess to me, or in an unguarded moment were somehow to let it be known that he either believes absurd things concerning God, and is even seeking for some carnal good in Him, and has endured those torments in defense of such an error, or from the desire of money for which he hoped, or else from an excessive eagerness for human praise, that love by which I was borne towards him is at once offended, and as it were rejected. But, although my love is withdrawn from that unworthy man, yet it remains in that form, according to which I had loved him when I believed him to be like that. Unless perhaps I now love him for this purpose, that he may be like that, when I had discovered that he was not.

Nothing has been changed in that man; yet he can be changed and can become what I had once believed him to be. But the estimation itself, which I formerly had of him in my mind, is not the same as that which I now have, and it certainly has undergone a change. And the same love has likewise been turned from the purpose of finding pleasure to the purpose of providing help, by virtue of the unchangeable justice commanding me from above. Nevertheless, the form of the unshaken and abiding truth itself, wherein I should have found enjoyment in that man when I believed him to be good, and wherein I counsel him to be good, sheds in its imperturbable eternity the same light of the incorruptible and most sound reason upon the gaze of my mind, as well as upon the cloud of images which I discern from above, when I again think of this same man whom I have seen.

Something similar takes place when I recall a beautifully and symmetrically involuted arch I have seen, for example, in Carthage. In this case a certain reality, which was made known to my mind through the eyes and transferred to my memory, produces an imaginary view. But in my mind I behold something else, according to which that work pleases me, and from which I should improve it if it displeased me. Therefore, we pass judgment upon these particular things according to that form of

the eternal truth, and we perceive that form through the eye of the rational mind. But these particular things we touch, if present, with the bodily sense, or recall them, if absent, through the image fixed in our memory, or form images of things that are similar to them, such as we ourselves would also endeavor to construct, if we wished and were able. For we form images of bodies in our mind or see bodies through the body in one way, but we comprehend in a different way the patterns[13] and the ineffably beautiful art of such forms, as are above the eye of the mind, by simple intelligence.

Chapter 7

(12) With the eye of the mind, therefore, we perceive in that eternal truth, from which all temporal things have been made, the form according to which we are, and by which we effect something either in ourselves or in bodies with a true and right reason. The true knowledge of things, thence conceived, we bear with us as a word, and beget by speaking from within; nor does it depart from us by being born. But in conversing with others we add the service of our voice or of some bodily sign to the word that remains within, in order to produce in the mind of the listener, by a kind of sensible remembrance, something similar to that which does not depart from the mind of the speaker. Thus there is nothing that we do through the members of our body, in our words and actions, by which the conduct of men is approved or disapproved, that is not preceded by the word that has been brought forth within us. For no one willingly does anything which he has not spoken previously in his heart.

Chapter 8

(13) This word is conceived in love, whether it be the word of the creature or the word of the Creator, that is, of a changeable nature or of the unchangeable truth. Therefore, it is conceived either by desire,[14] or love:[15] not that the creature ought not to be loved, but if that love for him is referred to the Creator, it will no longer be desire but love. For desire is then present when the creature is loved on account of himself. Then it

[13] *rationes.* [14] *cupiditas.* [15] *caritas.*

does not help him who uses it, but corrupts him who enjoys it.[16] Since the creature, therefore, is either equal or inferior to us, we must use the inferior for God and enjoy the equal, but in God. For just as you ought to enjoy yourself, but not in yourself but in Him who made you, so you ought also to enjoy him whom you love as yourself. And, therefore, let us enjoy ourselves and our brethren in the Lord, and not dare to return from there to ourselves, and, as it were, to let ourselves slip downwards. But the word is born when that which is thought pleases us, either for the purpose of committing sin or of acting rightly. Love, therefore, as a means, joins our word with the mind from which it is born; and as a third it binds itself with them in an incorporeal embrace, without any confusion.

Chapter 9

(14) The word that has been conceived and born is one and the same when the will rests in the knowledge of itself; this happens in the love of spiritual things. For example, he who knows justice perfectly and loves it perfectly is already just, even though the necessity does not exist for acting outwardly according to it through the members of his body. But in the love of carnal and temporal things, as in the offspring of animals, the conception of the word is one thing and the birth another thing. In such cases, what is conceived by desiring is born by attaining. For it does not suffice for avarice to know and love gold, unless it also possesses it; nor does it suffice to know and love to eat and to lie together, unless these actions are also performed; nor does it suffice to know and love honors and power, unless they are obtained. But all of these things do not suffice, even when they are acquired. "For he who shall drink of this water," He said, "shall thirst again" [*John* 4:13]. And, therefore, it is also said in the Psalm: "He conceived sorrow and brought forth iniquity" [*Psalm* 7:14]. He says that sorrow or labor is conceived, when those things are conceived which it does not suffice to know and to desire, and when the mind yearns for and grows sick for the want of them, until it arrives at them and as it were begets them. And for this reason *parta* [brought forth] is elegantly used in Latin for *reperta* [found] and *conperta* [discovered]; and these words sound as if they are derived from *partus* [bringing forth]. For "when concupiscence

[16] Here is one of many passages in Augustine's writings in which he warns us against enjoying what should be merely used and merely using what should be enjoyed. See his *De diversis quaestionibus* 83.30.

has conceived, it brings forth sin" [*James* 1:15]. Wherefore the Lord cries out: "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened" [*Matthew* 11:28], and in another place: "Woe to those who are with child, or have infants at the breast in those days" [*Matthew* 24:19]. Since he referred all things, whether rightly done or sins, to the bringing forth of the word He said: "For by thy mouth thou wilt be justified, and by thy mouth thou wilt be condemned" [*Matthew* 12:27]. He wanted "mouth" to be understood not in the sense of this visible mouth, but of that which is invisible and within, of the thought and the heart.

Chapter 10

(15) The question, then, is rightly raised, whether all knowledge is a word, or only knowledge that is loved. For we also know those things which we hate; but those that displease us cannot be said to be either conceived or brought forth in the mind. For not all things which touch it in any way are conceived; some things are only known, but may not be called words, as those we are now discussing. For we use the term "word" in one sense, when we speak of words which fill a determined space of time with their syllables, whether they are spoken or simply thought; in a different sense, when everything that is known is called a word impressed on our mind, as long as it can be brought forth from our memory and defined, even though the thing itself displeases us; and in still another sense when that which is conceived by the mind pleases us. What the Apostle says is to be understood according to this last kind of "word": "No one says, 'Lord Jesus,' except in the Holy Spirit" [*1 Corinthians* 12:3]; while they also say the same thing according to another meaning of "word," of whom the Lord Himself declares: "Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter into the kingdom of heaven" [*Matthew* 7:21].

But when we are rightly displeased with, and rightly disapprove of those things which we also hate, our disapproval of them is approved, is pleasing to us, and is a word. Neither does the knowledge of vices displease us, but the vices themselves. For I am pleased at being able to know and define what intemperance is, and this is its word. In the same way there are known faults in art, and the knowledge of them is rightly approved when an expert discerns the species and the lack of excellence, so as to affirm and to deny that it is and that it is not; still to be lacking in excellence and to be guilty of a fault is blameworthy. To define intemperance and to express its

word belongs to the knowledge of ethics, but to be intemperate belongs to what is branded as a fault by this knowledge. To know and define what a solecism is belongs to the art of speaking, but to be guilty of such is a defect which this same art blames. The word, therefore, which we now wish to discern and study is knowledge with love. Hence, when the mind knows and loves itself, its word is joined to it by love. And because the mind loves its knowledge and knows its love, then the word is in the love and love in the word, and both are in him who loves and who speaks.

Chapter 11

(16) But all knowledge according to the form[17] [of what is known] is similar to that which it knows. There is, in addition, a knowledge according to privation, which we express when we disapprove of something. This disapproval of privation commends the form, which is, therefore, approved. The mind, therefore, has a certain likeness to the form known to it, whether we are pleased with the form [known] or displeased with the privation of it.

Wherefore, we are like God inasmuch as we know Him, but we are not like Him to the extent of being His equal, because we do not know Him as He Himself knows Himself. And as, when we learn of bodies through our bodily sense, some likeness of them arises in our mind, and is a phantasm of the memory (for the bodies themselves are by no means in our mind when we think of them, but only their likenesses. Were we, therefore, to approve of the object for the image, we would be in error, for the approval of one thing for another is an error. Yet the image of the body in the mind is better than that bodily form, insofar as it is in a better nature, that is, in a living substance, such as the mind is.) So, when we know God, although we become better than we were before we knew Him, and especially when this knowledge being liked and loved worthily, is a word, and thereby produces some similarity to God. Yet that knowledge is less than He is, because it is in a lower nature; for the mind is creature, but God is Creator.

We conclude from this that, when the mind knows itself and approves what it knows, this same knowledge is in such way its word, that it is wholly and entirely on a par with it, is equal to, and is identical with it, because it is not the knowledge of a lower essence, such as the body, nor

[17] *secundum speciem.*

of a higher essence, such as God. And since knowledge has a likeness to that thing which it knows, namely, that of which it is the knowledge, then in this case it has a perfect and equal likeness, because the mind itself, which knows, is known. And, therefore, knowledge is both its image and its word, because it is an expression of that mind and is made equal to it by knowing, and because what is begotten is equal to its begetter.

Chapter 12

(17) What, then, is love? Will it not be an image? Will it not be a word? Will it not be begotten? For why should the mind beget its knowledge when it knows itself, and not beget its love when it loves itself? For if the cause of its knowing is, therefore, that it is knowable, then the cause of its loving is also that it is lovable. That being so, it is difficult to say why it has not begotten both. And this same question also arises concerning the most exalted Trinity itself, the most omnipotent God the Creator, in whose image man has been made [*Genesis* 9:6] also troubles people whom the truth of God invites to the faith through human language. Why, they ask, is not the Holy Spirit also believed or understood to be begotten by God the Father, so that He Himself may likewise be called the Son?

We are now endeavoring in one way or another to investigate this question in the human mind; and after the inferior image has responded as it were to our interrogation in language, with which our human nature itself is more familiar, we may be able to direct a better-trained mental vision from the illuminated creature to the unchangeable light; we presuppose, however, that the truth itself has persuaded us that, as no Christian doubts, the Son is the Word of God, so the Holy Spirit is love. Let us return, therefore, to that image which the creature is, that is, to the rational soul, for a more careful questioning and consideration of this matter. The knowledge of some things that exist in time which were not there previously, and the love of some things which were not loved previously, opens the way for us to explain more clearly what we have to say, because the thing which is comprehended in the order of time is more easily explained by speech itself, which must also be sent forth in time.

(18) To begin with, it is, therefore, clear that something can be knowable, that is, it can be the object of knowledge, and yet it may not be known; but it is impossible for something to be known that is not knowable. Therefore, we must obviously hold fast to this principle that everything

which we know begets the knowledge of itself within us at the same time. For knowledge is born from both, from the one who knows and the object that is known. When the mind, therefore, knows itself, it alone is the parent of its own knowledge, for it is itself both the object known and the one that knows. It was, however, knowable to itself, even before it knew itself; but the knowledge of itself was not in it, since it had not yet known itself. Hence, when it knows itself, it begets a knowledge of itself that is equal to itself. For it does not know itself as less than it is, nor is its knowledge that of another essence, not only because it is itself that which knows, but also because it knows itself, as we have said above.

What, then, are we to say about love? When the mind loves itself, does it not also seem to have begotten the love of itself? For it was lovable to itself even before it loved itself, because it could love itself, just as it was knowable to itself even before it knew itself, because it could know itself. For if it were not knowable to itself, it would never have been able to know itself; so, if it were not lovable to itself, it would never have been able to love itself. Why do we not say, therefore, that it has begotten its own love, as we say that by knowing itself it has begotten its own knowledge? Is it, perhaps, to indicate clearly that this is the principle of love from which it proceeds – for it proceeds from the mind itself that is lovable to itself before it loves itself, and so is the principle of its own love by which it loves itself – but that it is, therefore, not rightly said to be begotten by the mind, as is the knowledge of itself by which it knows itself, because that has already been found through knowledge which is called born or discovered,[18] and is usually preceded by a search which will come to rest in knowledge as its goal?

For inquiry is a desire to find, which is the same as saying, to discover. But things that are discovered are, as it were, brought forth. Hence, they are similar to an offspring; but how else are they born, except through knowledge itself? For they are, as it were, uttered there and formed. For even though the things already were, which we find by seeking, yet the knowledge itself did not exist which we regard as an offspring that is born. Further, that desire, which is latent in seeking, proceeds from one who seeks, remains as it were in suspense, and only comes to rest in the goal towards which it is directed, when that which is sought has been found and is united with him who seeks. Although this desire, that is, this

[18] *partum vel repertum.*

seeking does not seem to be love, by which that which is known is loved, for we are still striving to know, yet it is something of the same kind.

For it can already be called "will," since everyone who seeks wishes to find; and if what he seeks belongs to the order of knowledge, then everyone who seeks wishes to know. And if he wishes it ardently and earnestly, he is said to study, a term we generally use for those who pursue and acquire any branch of learning. A kind of desire, therefore, precedes the birth in the mind, and by means of it, that is, by our seeking and finding what we wish to know, an offspring, namely, knowledge itself is born. Therefore, that desire by which knowledge is conceived and born cannot be rightly called a "birth" and "offspring"; and this same desire by which one yearns for the knowing of the thing becomes love of the thing when known, while it holds and embraces the beloved offspring, that is, knowledge, and unites it to its begetter.

And so there is a certain image of the Trinity: the mind itself, its knowledge, which is its offspring, and love as a third; these three are one and one substance. The offspring is not less, while the mind knows itself as much as it is; nor is the love less, while the mind loves itself as much as it knows and as much as it is.

Book 10

Outline

1. Since we cannot love what is unknown to us, what motivates us to get to know anything? (1.1.–2.4)
2. How, in particular, can the mind seek to know itself? (3.5–4.6)
3. Becoming preoccupied with images of bodies, the mind may become confused about itself. (5.7–6.8)
4. Thus, some have come to think the mind is blood, brain, or some other bodily thing. (7.9)
5. But, unlike a body, no part of the mind occupies less extension than the whole. (7.10)
6. Nothing is so present to the mind as the mind itself. (7.10–9.12)
7. The nature of the mind is to be discovered in what we cannot doubt about ourselves, e.g., that we live, remember, understand, will, think, know, and judge. (10.13–14)
8. Since the mind is certain of its essence and is not certain that it is anything bodily, it is not [essentially] anything bodily. (10.15–16)
9. Memory, understanding, and will together constitute an image of the Divine Trinity. (11.17–12.19)

Chapter 1

Let us now proceed in an orderly fashion, with a more exact purpose, to explain these same questions more thoroughly. First of all, since no one can in any way love a thing that is wholly unknown, we must carefully examine of what sort is the love of those who study, that is, of those who do not yet know a branch of knowledge, but are eager to learn it. For even

with respect to those things to which the term "study" is not generally applied, love often arises by simply hearing about them. Thus from a report of any beautiful thing our mind yearns to see and to enjoy it. For it knows the beauties of bodies generically, since it has seen very many of them, and there is something within it which gives its approval to that for which it outwardly yearns. And when this happens, love is aroused for something that is not entirely unknown, since its genus is thus known. Our love for a good man, however, whose face we have not seen is based on our knowledge of his virtues, which we already know in the truth itself.

It is, however, the prestige of those who praise and teach different subjects that generally stimulates us to learn them. And yet, unless some slight knowledge of a doctrine were impressed upon our mind, we would in no way be enkindled with the desire of learning it. Who, for example, would devote any time or toil to rhetoric if he did not previously know that it is the art of speaking? We are also amazed at times when we hear about or experience the results of learning, and hence, we yearn to acquire, by learning, the faculty of achieving the same results ourselves. It is as if you were to tell an illiterate man that there is a certain kind of learning by which anyone is capable of sending words, made silently by the hand, to someone far away, and that the one to whom they are sent understands them, not by the ears but by the eyes, and you were to prove this by an actual demonstration. Is not that man, while eager to know how this can be done, altogether moved to apply himself to study for the sake of achieving a result he already knows and possesses? The studious minds of learners are enkindled in this manner, because no one can in any way love something of which he is absolutely ignorant.

(2) So, too, if anyone hears an unknown sign, for example, the sound of a word whose meaning he does not know, he desires to know what it is, and what idea that sound is intended to convey to his mind. Let us give an example. Suppose someone hears the word *temetum*, and in his ignorance asks what it means. He must, for that reason, already know that it is a sign, namely, that it is not a mere sound,[1] but that it signifies something. This word of three syllables is in other respects already known, and has impressed its articulated form[2] on his mind through the sense of hearing. What more can be required for his greater knowledge, if all the letters

[1] Or: utterance, *vox*. [2] *species*.

and all the spaces of sound are already known, unless it shall have become known to him at the same time that it is a sign, and shall have moved him with the desire of knowing the thing of which it is the sign?

Hence, the more a thing is known, but not fully known, the more the mind[3] desires to know the rest. For if he knew that it was only a sound, and did not know that it was a sign of something, he would seek no further, since he had perceived the sensible thing in his consciousness as far as he could. But because he already knew that it was not only a sound, but also a sign, he wishes to know it perfectly. But no sign is known perfectly if it is not known of what thing it is a sign. If anyone, therefore, applies himself with ardent diligence to know, and inflamed with this zeal continues this search, can he be said to be without love?

What, then, does he love? For certainly a thing cannot be loved unless it is known. Nor does he love those three syllables that he already knows. (What if he were to love this in them, that he knows they signify something? But that question does not concern us at the moment, for he does not seek to know this.) We are inquiring about what it is that he loves in the thing that he is eager to know, and which certainly he does not yet know; and we wonder why he loves it, since we know with absolute certainty that nothing can be loved unless it is known.

What does he love then, except that he knows and beholds in the reasons of things, what the beauty of learning is, in which the knowledge of all the signs is contained; and what usefulness there is in that skill by which human society mutually communicates its thoughts, so that the assemblies of men may not be worse for them than any solitude, if they were to share their thoughts in conversation.

The soul, therefore, perceives, knows, and loves this beautiful and useful form,[4] and whoever seeks the meaning of whatever significant words he does not know is endeavoring as much as he can to perfect it in himself. For what he sees in the light of the truth is one thing, and what he desires within his own faculty is another thing. For in the light of the truth he realizes how great and how good it is to understand and to speak all the languages of all the countries, to hear no language as foreign, and to be so heard in every language that no one may detect him as a foreigner. The splendor of such knowledge is already seen in his thoughts, and is loved by him as something known; and it is so seen and so arouses the zeal of learners that

[3] *animus.* [4] *species.*

they are spurred into activity on account of it. They yearn for it in all the labor which they expend in acquiring this faculty, so that they may also embrace in practice what they already know in theory. And so the closer he comes to this faculty in hope, the more ardently he is inflamed with love.

For he devotes himself more intensely to those sciences when he does not despair of being able to master them. For one who is not buoyed up by the hope of acquiring something either loves it tepidly or does not love it at all, though he may perceive how beautiful it is. Consequently, since almost all despair of knowing all languages, each one strives to become particularly proficient in that of his own people. And if he realizes that he cannot grasp even this one perfectly, yet no one is so slothful as not to want to know the meaning of a word that he does not know, and if he is able, he asks and learns it. He is certainly eager for knowledge, since he asks this question, and it would seem as if he loved something unknown, but in reality it is not so.

For that form[5] touches the mind that knows and thinks; it reveals the beauty of minds that have been brought together in fellowship by listening to and answering questions through signs that are known. And this form enkindles him with zeal, who is looking indeed for something he does not know, but who beholds and loves the form[6] that he does know, to which the unknown thing belongs. Hence, if you say to someone who asks you what *temetum* means – for this is the word that we used for an illustration – "What does that matter to you?" he will reply: "Lest perhaps I may hear it spoken and may not understand, or perhaps I may read it somewhere and may not know what the author means." Who, pray, will say to him: "Do not seek to understand what you hear; do not seek to know what you read"?

For the beauty of this knowledge, through which men's thoughts are mutually made known by the enunciation of significant words is quickly discerned by almost all rational minds; and because he knows the beauty of this knowledge and loves it because he knows it, he, therefore, eagerly searches for the unknown word. Therefore, when he hears and learns that wine was called "*temetum*" by the ancients, but that this word is now obsolete and is not used nowadays in our language, he will perhaps think that he should still know it, on account of some of the books by the ancient authors. But if he judges that they are also superfluous, then he no longer believes that it is worth remembering, because he does not perceive any

[5] *species*. [6] *forma*.

connection between it and that form[7] of learning which is known to his mind and upon which he gazes and loves.

(3) Wherefore, every love of a studious mind, that is, of a mind that wants to know what it does not know, is not the love of that thing which it does not know, but of that which it does know, and on account of which it wishes to know what it does not know. Or if there is anyone so curious as to be carried away, not on account of something already known, but by the mere love of knowing the unknown, then in that case we have to distinguish, of course, between the curious and the studious person; yet even the curious one does not love what he does not know; nay rather, it is more appropriate to say of him that he hates the unknown, because he wishes nothing to be unknown, while he wishes to know all things.

But lest anyone should propose a more difficult question to us by saying that it is just as impossible to hate what one does not know as it is to love what one does not know, we will not gainsay the truth of this statement; nevertheless, this must be understood: when you say, "He loves to know the unknown," it is not the same as saying, "He loves the unknown." The first can happen, namely, that one loves to know the unknown, but it is impossible to love the unknown. The word "know" has not been put there without reason, since he who loves to know the unknown does not love the unknown, but the knowing of it. For unless he knows what it is to know, no one would be able to say with confidence, either that he does know, or that he does not know. For not only he who says and truly says, "I know," has to know what it is to know, but also he who says, "I do not know," and says it confidently and truly, and knows that he is saying it truly, certainly knows what it is to know. For he also distinguishes one who knows from one who does not know when he beholds himself truly and says, I do not know. Since he knows that he is saying it truly, whence would he know it if he did not know what it is to know?

Chapter 2

(4) No studious person and no curious person, therefore, loves the unknown, even when he presses forward with the utmost eagerness to know the unknown. For he either already knows generically what he loves, and is now eager to know it in some particular thing or things which he does

[7] *species.*

not know, but whose praises he has perhaps heard. He therefore frames in his mind an imaginary picture by which he may be aroused to love. (But from what does he picture it except from those things which he already knows?) Yet perhaps he will not love the form that was praised when he discovers how unlike it is to the one which he pictured in his mind, and which was most fully known in his thoughts. And if he shall love it, he will begin to love it from that moment when he got to know it. For it is different from that form which he loved a little before, and which the mind that formed it was wont to exhibit to itself. If, however, he shall find it similar to that form of which he had heard reports and can truly say to it, I already loved you, even then he certainly did not love it as unknown, since he had already known it in that likeness.

Or we see something in the form of the eternal reason[8] and love it there. And when this is reproduced in some image[9] of a temporal thing, and we give credence to it and love it on account of those experienced ones who praise it, we do not love anything unknown, according to the principle that we have already discussed at sufficient length. Or, again we love something known, and on account of it, we seek something unknown. In that case, it is by no means the love of the unknown, but of the known thing, that holds us fast, to which we know that the unknown thing belongs, so that we also know that what we seek is still unknown, as I said a little before when speaking of the unknown word. Or finally, everyone loves knowing, a fact that cannot be unknown to anyone who desires to know something.

For these reasons they appear to love unknown things, who wish to know something that they do not know, and on account of their ardent desire in seeking, we cannot say that they are without love. But I think that I have persuaded those, who carefully behold the truth, that this is not really so, and that it is impossible to love something that is wholly unknown. But, as the examples that we have given referred only to those who desire to know something which they themselves are not, let us see if perhaps some new idea appears when the mind desires to know itself.

Chapter 3

(5) What, then, does the mind love, when it seeks passionately to know itself while it is unknown to itself? Behold! the mind seeks to know itself and is inflamed with this desire. Therefore, it loves, but what does it love?

[8] *in specie sempiternae rationis.* [9] *effigies.*

Itself? But how, since it does not yet know itself, and no one can love what he does not know? Or has it become acquainted with its own beauty in the same way as we usually hear about people who are absent by means of a report? Perhaps, then, it does not love itself at all, but the image which it forms of itself, and which may be far different from itself. Or if the mind forms an image that is like itself, and, then when it loves this representation[10] it loves itself before it knows itself, because it beholds something like itself. Then, perhaps, it knows other minds from which it forms an image of itself, and so it is already known to itself generically. But why then does it not know itself, since it knows other minds, if nothing can be more present to itself than itself? But if it were with the mind as with the eyes of the body, to which the eyes of others are better known than its own eyes are to themselves, then let it not seek itself for it will never find itself. For eyes will never see themselves except in a mirror; nor are we to believe in any way that such means may be also used for the contemplation of incorporeal things, as that the mind should know itself as it were in a mirror.

Or does it see in the reason of the eternal truth how beautiful it is to know itself, and does it love that which it sees there, and endeavor to realize it in itself? For although it does not know itself, yet at least it knows how good it would be to be known to itself. And this is indeed very remarkable, that it does not yet know itself, and it already knows how beautiful it is to know itself. Or does it see some excellent end, that is, its own security and blessedness through some secret remembrance that has not left it in its progress towards distant places, and does it believe that it cannot arrive at this end unless it knows itself? Thus while it loves the one, it seeks the other: it loves the one as known, and on account of it seeks the unknown. But why was it possible for the remembrance of its own blessedness to continue, and impossible for the remembrance of itself to continue along with it, so that it would know both itself which wills to attain, as well as the end which it wills to attain? Or is it that when it loves to know itself, it does not love itself which it does not yet know, but loves knowing itself, and that it feels the more exasperated at lacking its own knowledge by which it wishes to know all things? But it knows what knowing is, and while it loves what it knows, it also desires to know itself.

But where does it know its own knowing, if it does not know itself? For it knows that it knows other things, but does not know itself; therefore,

[10] *figmentum*.

it also knows what knowing is. How then does that which does not know itself, know itself as knowing something? For it does not know another mind as knowing, but itself. Therefore, it knows itself. Thus, when it seeks to know itself, it already knows that it is seeking itself. Therefore, it already knows itself. Hence, it cannot be altogether ignorant of itself, since it certainly knows itself, insofar as it knows that it does not know itself. But if it does not know that it does not know itself, then it does not seek itself in order to know itself. And, therefore, the very fact that it seeks itself clearly shows that it is more known than unknown to itself. For it knows itself as seeking and not knowing, while it seeks to know itself.

Chapter 4

(6) Then what shall we say? That the mind knows itself in part, and in part does not know itself? But it is absurd to claim that it does not know as a whole what it knows. I do not say that it knows wholly, but that what it knows, it knows as a whole. When it, therefore, knows something of itself which it cannot know except as a whole, it knows itself as a whole. But it knows itself as knowing something, nor can it, except as a whole, know anything. Therefore, it knows itself as a whole.

Furthermore, what of itself is so known to it as the fact that it lives?[11] But it cannot both be a mind and not live, since it also has something over and above this, namely, that it understands. For the souls of beasts also live, but do not understand. As the mind, therefore, is a whole mind, so it lives as a whole. But it knows that it lives. Therefore, it knows itself as a whole.

Finally, when the mind seeks to know itself, it already knows that it is a mind, otherwise, it would not know whether it seeks itself and perhaps would seek one thing for another. For it might possibly be that it is not a mind, and so while it seeks to know a mind, it does not seek itself. Wherefore, since the mind, in seeking what the mind is, knows that it seeks itself, it certainly knows that itself is a mind. Again if it knows in itself that it is a mind, and that it is a whole mind, it knows itself as a whole.

But suppose that it does not know that it is a mind, and that when seeking itself it only knows that it seeks itself. For so, too, it may seek one thing for another if it does not know this; but that it may not seek one thing for another, it must doubtless know what it seeks. And if it knows

[11] This idea will be picked up and developed further in the *cogito*-like reasoning at DT 15.12.21.

what it seeks, and seeks itself, it certainly knows itself. What further things should it, therefore, seek? But if it knows itself in part, but still seeks itself in part, then it does not seek itself, but a part of itself. But when we speak of the mind, we speak of it as a whole. And furthermore, because it knows that it has not yet been found by itself as a whole, it knows how great is the whole. Thus it seeks for what is wanting, as we generally seek to recall to mind something that has escaped us, but yet has not slipped away entirely; for when it shall come, we can recognize it as the thing for which we were seeking.

But how can the mind come into the mind, as if it were possible for the mind not to be in the mind? Add to this, that if it is found in part, then the mind does not seek itself as a whole; but yet it does seek itself as a whole. Therefore, it is present to itself as a whole, and there is nothing further to be sought. For nothing is wanting to the mind that seeks; only the object that is sought is wanting. Since it, therefore, seeks itself as a whole, nothing is wanting to it of itself. Or if it does not seek itself as a whole, but a part that has been found seeks a part that has not yet been found, then the mind does not seek itself, of which no part seeks itself. For the part that has been found does not seek itself; nor does the part that has not been found seek itself, since it is sought by that part that has already been found. Consequently, since neither the mind as a whole seeks itself, nor does any part of it seek itself, then the mind does not seek itself at all.

Chapter 5

(7) Why, then, was it commanded to know itself?[12] I believe it was so commanded that it might consider itself and live according to its nature, that is, that it might desire to be ruled according to its nature, namely, under Him to whom it ought to be subject, and above those things to which it is to be preferred; under Him by whom it ought to be governed and above those things which it ought to govern. For it does many things through evil desires, as though it had forgotten itself.

[12] Augustine does not explain why he takes the ancient Greek admonition, "Know thyself!" to be aimed at the mind in particular. But Cicero, in his first *Tusculan Disputation*, which Augustine seems to have had freshly in his mind when he wrote *De Trinitate* 10, does discuss the issue briefly. "For I do not believe," writes Cicero of the maxim, "Know thyself!" "that it instructs us to know the members of our body, or our stature, or our shape; nor are we our bodies, nor do I, saying this to you, speak to your body. Thus when [Apollo] says this, 'Know yourself!' he means this: 'Know your mind [*animus*]!'" (1.22.52)

For it sees certain intrinsically beautiful things in that more excellent nature which is God. Whereas it ought to remain steadfast in order to enjoy them wanting to appropriate these things to itself and to be like Him, but not by Him, but by its own self to be what He is, it is turned away from Him; it is moved and sinks into being less and less, which it considers to be more and more. For it is not sufficient to itself, nor is anything at all sufficient to him who departs from Him who is alone sufficient. And, therefore, through its need and want, it becomes excessively intent upon its own actions and the fickle pleasures it obtains through them. And thus by desiring to seek knowledge from these things that are without, the nature of which it knows and loves and which it feels can be lost unless held fast by devoted care, it loses its security; and it thinks of itself so much the less, the more certain it is that it cannot lose itself.

Thus, although it is one thing not to know oneself, and another thing not to think of oneself – for we do not say that a man, skilled in many branches of knowledge, is ignorant of grammar when he is not thinking of it, because he is then thinking of the art of medicine – although it is, therefore, one thing not to know oneself and another thing not to think of oneself, yet the force of love is so great that the mind draws in with itself those things upon which it has long reflected with love, and to which it has become attached by its devoted care, even when it returns in some way to think of itself. And because they are bodies which it has loved outside of itself through the senses of the body, and with which it has become entangled by a kind of daily familiarity, it cannot bring them into itself as though into a country of incorporeal nature, and, therefore, it fastens together their images, which it has made out of itself, and forces them into itself. For in forming them it gives them something of its own essence, but it also keeps something by which it may freely judge the form of these images; this is what is called more precisely the mind, namely, the rational understanding,[13] which is kept in order to pass judgment. For we perceive that we have, in common with the beasts, those parts of the soul that are informed by the images of bodies.

Chapter 6

(8) However, the mind errs when it binds itself to these images with a love so strong as even to regard itself as something of this kind. And thus it is

[13] *rationalis intelligentia.*

made like them to some extent, not in reality but in thought, not that it thinks itself to be their image, but to be wholly that very thing of which it has an image in itself. For the power of judging within it is still strong enough to distinguish the body which it has left without, from the image which it bears of it within itself, except when these same images are so represented as if felt without and not as thought within, as happens in the case of people when asleep, or in a frenzy, or in an ecstasy.

Chapter 7

(9) When the mind, therefore, regards itself as something of this kind, it regards itself as a body. And since it is well aware of its superiority, by which it rules the body, it has thus come about that some people asked what there is in the body that is stronger than the body, and they judged it to be the mind, or the whole soul in general. And so some thought it to be the blood, others the brain, others the heart, but not in the sense of Scripture when it says: "I will confess to thee, O Lord, in all my heart" [*Psalm* 110:1] and "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart" [*Matthew* 22:37], since by a catachresis or metaphor this word is transferred from the body to the soul; but they believed that it was actually that small part of the body that we see when the entrails are torn asunder.

Others believe that it consisted of very minute and indivisible bodies called "atoms," which meet and cling together. Others said that its substance was air, others fire. Others could not think of any substance except as a body, and since they found that the soul was not a body, they said that it was not a substance at all, but the harmony itself of our body, or the combining of the primary substances by which that flesh is, as it were, joined together. And, consequently, all these have regarded the soul as mortal; for, whether it were a body or some arrangement of the body, in either case it could certainly not live forever.

Indeed, some have declared that its substance was a kind of life, altogether different from corporeal life. For they have found it to be a life that vivifies and animates every living body, and have attempted to prove, as each one could, that it must logically be also immortal, since life cannot be without life. Some add a fifth body – I do know not what – to the well-known four elements of this world and from it, so they say, the mind comes. But I do not believe that we should spend a long time discussing it in this place. For, either they use the term "body" in the same sense as

we do, namely, that of which a part is less than the whole in the extension of place,[14] and then we must number them among those who believe the mind to be corporeal; or, if they call every substance, or every changeable substance, a body, although aware that not every substance is contained in the extension of place by length, width, and height, we need not dispute with them about a question of words.

(10) Whoever sees in all these opinions that the nature of the mind is a substance, and certainly not a corporeal one, that is, it does not occupy a less extension of place with a less part of itself, and a greater with a greater part, ought to see at the same time that those who regard the mind as a corporeal substance do not go astray because their mind is lacking in knowledge, but because they add those things without which they are unable to conceive of any nature. For when commanded to think of anything without bodily phantasms, they judge that this is absolutely nothing. And, therefore, the mind would not seek itself as though wanting to itself.

For what is so present to knowledge as that which is present to the mind? Or what is so present to the mind as the mind itself? And, hence, if we also trace back the origin of the word "discovery" [*inventio*], what else does it mean, than that to discover is to come [*venio*] into [*in*] that which is sought? And, consequently, we do not usually say that things which come as it were spontaneously into the mind are discovered, although they can be called "known." The reason is, because we do not set out in search of them in order to come into them, that is, to discover them. Wherefore, as that which the eye or any other sense of the body seeks, the mind itself seeks (for it also directs the sense of the body, and then discovers when this same sense comes into that which is sought); so it finds other things which it must know, not through the medium of any bodily sense, but through itself when it comes into them; it finds them either in a higher substance, that is, in God, or in some other parts of the soul, as when it passes judgment on the images of the bodies themselves; for it finds them within, in the soul, impressed by the body.

Chapter 8

(11) How the mind may seek and find itself is, therefore, a remarkable question: at what should it aim to seek itself, or where should it come to

[14] Compare Descartes' notion of body as "extended thing" (*res extensa*) as he explains it early in *Meditation* II.

find itself? For what is so much in the mind as the mind? But because it is in those things of which it thinks with love, and it has grown accustomed to thinking of sensible things, that is, of bodies, with love, it is incapable of being in itself without the images of those things. From this arises its shameful error, that it can no longer distinguish the images of sensible things from itself, so as to see itself alone. For they have marvelously adhered to it with the glue of love, and this is its uncleanness that, while it endeavors to think of itself alone, it regards itself as being that without which it cannot think of itself.

When it is, therefore, commanded to know itself, it should not seek itself as though it were to be withdrawn from itself, but it should rather withdraw what it has added to itself. For it is more deeply within, not only than those sensible things which are evidently without, but even than their images which are in a some part of the soul even beasts have, though they lack the intelligence[15] which is proper to the mind. As the mind, therefore, is within, it goes in some way outside of itself when it directs the affection of its love towards these sensible things which leave their footprints, as it were, in our mind because we have thought of them so often. These footprints are, so to speak, impressed on the memory when the corporeal things which are without are so perceived that, even when they are absent, their images are present to those who think of them.

Let the mind, therefore, know itself, and not seek itself as though it were absent; let it fix the attention of its will, by which it formerly wandered over many things, upon itself, and think of itself. So it will see that there never was a time when it did not love itself, and never a time when it did not know itself; but because it loved another thing with itself, it has confused itself with this other thing, and has, in a certain way, grown together with it. And so while it embraces diverse things as though they were one, it came to regard as one, things that are diverse.

Chapter 9

(12) Let not the mind, therefore, seek itself as though it were absent, but let it take care to discern itself as present. Let it not know itself as though it did not know itself, but how to distinguish itself from that which it knows to be another thing. When it hears the command: "Know thyself," how will it be able to carry it out if it does not know what "know" means,

[15] *intelligentia*.

and what "thyself" means? If, however, it knows what both mean, then it also knows itself.

For it is not said to the mind: "Know thyself," as it is said: "Know the Cherubim and the Seraphim!" For they are absent, and we believe what we have been taught concerning them, that they are certain heavenly powers. Nor as it is said: "Know the will of that man!" It is utterly impossible for us either to perceive or to understand his will unless he makes it known by some corporeal signs, and even then we would believe rather than understand. Nor as it is said to a man: "Look at your face!" This can only be done by means of a mirror. For our face is also absent from our eye because it is not in a place to which our eye can be directed. But when it is said to the mind: "Know thyself," it knows itself at the very instant in which it understands the word "thyself"; and it knows itself for no other reason than that it is present to itself. But if it does not understand what is said, it certainly does not obey this command. And, therefore, it does what it is commanded to do when it understands the command itself.

Chapter 10

(13) Let not the mind then add another thing to that which it knows itself to be when it hears that it should know itself. For it knows with certainty that these words are said to itself, that is, to itself that is, lives, and understands. But a corpse also is, and a beast also lives, but neither the corpse nor the beast understands. It, therefore, knows itself to be and to live in the way the understanding exists and lives.[16] Consequently, when the mind, for example, regards itself as air, then it thinks that the air understands, but it knows that itself understands, while it does not know that it is air, but only thinks so.

Let it, therefore, separate that which it thinks itself to be, and consider only that which it knows. Let this remain to it, which not even they have doubted who regarded the mind as this or that kind of a body. For not every mind regards itself as air, but, as I mentioned above, some regard it as fire, others as a brain, and others as this or that kind of a body. All know, however, that they understand and live; they refer what they understand

[16] Thus the mind could conceivably know itself to be and to live in the "afterlife," if there is such a thing, without even knowing whether it is embodied. This claim is close to, but not identical with, Descartes' claim to be able to understand his nature as a mind even before he has been able to assure himself that he knows that any body exists.

to the understanding, but refer being and life to themselves. And no one doubts that no one understands who does not live, and that no one lives who does not exist. Therefore, it follows that that which understands also exists[17] and lives, not as a corpse, which does not live, exists, nor as the soul[18] that does not understand lives, but in its own proper and more exalted manner.

Moreover, they know that they will, and they likewise know that no one can will, who is not and who does not live; and similarly, they refer the will to something which they will with that will. They also know that they remember, and they know at the same time that no one would remember unless he both existed and lived; but we also refer the memory itself to something which we remember with the memory. In two of these three, therefore, in the memory and the understanding, the knowledge and science of many things are contained; but the will is present by which we may enjoy or use them. For we enjoy the things that we know when the will rests by rejoicing in them for their own sake; but we use things by referring them to something else which we are to enjoy. Neither is the life of man vicious nor culpable in any other way than in enjoying things badly and in using them badly.[19] But we shall not enter into a discussion of this subject at the present time.

(14) But since we are investigating the nature of the mind, let us not take into consideration any knowledge that is obtained from without through the senses of the body, and consider more attentively the principle which we have laid down: that every mind knows and is certain concerning itself. For men have doubted whether the power to live, to remember, to understand, to will, to think, to know, and to judge is due to air, to fire, or to the brain, or to the blood, or to atoms, or to a fifth body – I do not know what it is – but it differs from the four customary elements; or whether the combining or the orderly arrangement of the flesh is capable of producing these effects; one has tried to maintain this opinion, another that opinion.

On the other hand who would doubt that he lives, remembers, understands, wills, thinks, knows, and judges? For even if he doubts, he lives; if he doubts, he remembers why he doubts; if he doubts, he understands

[17] Here and in what follows we find, again, reasoning of the sort that is more fully developed in DT 15.12.21.

[18] *anima*. The living *anima* that does not understand, that is, think, is the soul of a beast. The *anima* that does understand, that is, think, is an *animus* or rational soul. See DT 15.1.1.

[19] Here Augustine appeals to his famous distinction between what is to be used (*uti*) and what is to be enjoyed (*frui*). See his *De diversis quaestionibus* 83.30.

that he doubts; if he doubts, he wishes to be certain; if he doubts, he thinks; if he doubts, he knows that he does not know; if he doubts, he judges that he ought not to consent rashly. Whoever then doubts about anything else ought never to doubt about all of these; for if they were not, he would be unable to doubt about anything at all.

(15) Those who regard the mind either as a body or as the arrangement or harmony of the body, wish all these things to be seen in a subject. Thus the air, the fire, or some other body would be the substance which they call the mind, while the understanding would be in this body as its quality; and so the former would be the subject and the latter in the subject; that is, the mind which they regard as a body is the subject, while the understanding, and the other above-mentioned qualities of which we are certain, would be in the subject. And even those who do not regard the mind as a body, but as the structure[20] or harmony of the body, are pretty nearly of the same opinion. For they differ in this respect: the former say that the mind itself is a substance, wherein the understanding is present as in a subject; but the latter declare that the mind itself is in a subject, that is, in a body of which it is the arrangement[21] or harmony. Wherefore, can they logically maintain anything else than that the understanding is also in the same body as in a subject?

(16) All these people overlook the fact that the mind knows itself, even when it seeks itself, as we have already shown. But we can in no way rightly say that anything is known while its substance [or: essence[22]] is unknown. Wherefore, since the mind knows itself, it knows its own substance [or: essence]. But it is certain about itself, as is clearly shown from what we have already said. But it is by no means certain whether it is air, or fire, or a body, or anything of a body. It is, therefore, none of these things. And it belongs to that whole which is commanded to know itself, to be certain that it is none of those things of which it is uncertain, and to be certain that it alone is the only thing of which it is certain.

For the mind thinks of fire in the same way as it thinks of air or any other bodily thing of which it thinks. But it can in no way happen that it should think of that which itself is, in the same way as it thinks of that which it itself is not. For all these, whether fire, or air, or this or that body, or that part or it thinks of by means of an imaginary phantasy, nor is it

[20] *compago*. [21] *compositio*.
[22] As previously noted, Augustine says that in his Latin "*substantia*" and "*essentia*" are interchangeable.

said to be all of these, but one or the other of them. But if it were any one of them, it would think of this one in a different manner from the rest.[23] That is to say, it would not think of it by means of an imaginary phantasy, as absent things or something of the same kind are thought of which have been touched by the sense of the body, but it would think of it by a kind of inward presence not feigned but real – for there is nothing more present to it than itself; just as it thinks that it lives, and remembers, and understands, and wills. And if it adds nothing from these thoughts to itself, so as to regard itself as something of the kind, then whatever still remains to it of itself, that alone is itself.

Chapter 11

(17) Let us, therefore, put aside for the time being the rest of the things of which the mind is certain concerning itself, and discuss the three that demand special consideration: the memory, the understanding, and the will. For it is from these three that we are also wont to gain an insight into the talents and the character of the young. For the more tenaciously and the more easily a boy remembers, the more acutely he understands; and the more eagerly he studies, the more praiseworthy is his talent. But when we inquire into a person's learning, we do not ask about the sureness or the facility of his memory, or the keenness of his understanding, but what he remembers and what he understands. And because a mind is deemed worthy of praise, not only for its learning, but also for its goodness, we have to consider not only what it remembers and understands, but also what it wills – not how ardently it wills, but first what it wills and then how much it wills it. For a mind that loves fervently is only to be praised when that which it loves deserves to be fervently loved.

When we speak, therefore, of these three, talent, learning, and use,[24] our judgment upon the first of these three depends upon what a man can do in his memory and understanding and will. In the second we consider what each one has in his memory and understanding, and at what point he has arrived by his studious will. But the third one, use, lies in the will which disposes of those things that are contained in the memory and the

[23] That is, it would think fire, or air, or the brain, or whatever, without having to represent it to itself, say, through a mental image. It would do this because, as Augustine insists, the mind is immediately present to itself; it does not need to pick out or identify itself to itself to think of itself.

[24] Cf. Cicero, *De inventione* 2.53.160.

understanding, whether it refers them to something else, or rests satisfied in them as an end. For to use is to take up something into the power of the will, but to enjoy is to use with the joy, not of hope, but of the actual thing. Therefore, everyone who enjoys, uses, for he takes up something into the power of the will and finds pleasure in it as an end. But not everyone who uses, enjoys, if he has sought after that which he takes up into the power of the will, not on account of the thing itself, but on account of something else.

(18) Since these three, memory, understanding, and will, are, therefore, not three lives but one life, not three minds but one mind, it follows that they are certainly not three substances, but one substance. For when we speak of memory as life, mind, and substance, we speak of it in respect to itself; but when we speak of it simply as memory, we speak of it in relation to something else.[25] We may also say the same of the understanding and the will; for they are called understanding and will with relation to something else, yet each in respect to itself is life, mind, and essence. Therefore, these three are one in that they are one life, one mind, and one essence. And whatever else they are called in respect to themselves, they are spoken of together, not in the plural but in the singular.

But they are three in that they are mutually referred to each other. And if they were not equal, not only each one to each one, but each one to all, they would certainly not comprehend each other. For not only is each one comprehended by each one, but all are also comprehended by each one. For I remember that I have memory, understanding, and will; and I understand that I understand, will, and remember; and I will that I will, remember, and understand. At the same time I remember my whole memory, understanding, and will. For what I do not remember of my memory is not in my memory. But nothing is so much in the memory as the memory itself. Therefore, I remember my whole memory.

I likewise know that I understand whatever I understand, and I know that I will whatever I will; but whatever I know, I remember. Therefore, I remember my whole understanding and my whole will. Similarly, when I understand these three, I understand them as a whole at the same time. For there is nothing of intelligible things that I do not understand except what I do not know. But what I do not know, I neither remember nor will. Therefore, whatever of intelligible things I do not understand, it

[25] That is, in relation to the one who remembers. Of course, Augustine has in mind here a parallel to relative predication in talk about persons of the Divine Trinity, as when we say that the Son is son of the Father.

follows that I do not remember or will either. On the other hand, whatever of intelligible things I do remember and will, it follows that I also understand. My will also comprehends my whole understanding and my whole memory, if only I make use of the whole of what I understand and remember. Wherefore, when all are mutually comprehended by each one, and are comprehended as wholes, then each one as a whole is equal to each other one as a whole, and each one as a whole is equal to all together as wholes; and these three are one life, one mind, and one essence.

Chapter 12

(19) Should we now, therefore, exert ourselves to the utmost of our mental powers, and ascend to the supreme and highest essence of which the human mind is an inferior image, but an image nevertheless? Or should these same three things be manifested still more clearly in the soul, through those things which we comprehend outwardly through the sense of the body, wherein the knowledge of corporeal things is impressed in time?

We made the following discovery about the nature of the mind through its own memory, understanding, and will: just as it always knows and always wills itself, so at the same time it always remembers itself, always understands itself, and always loves itself, even though it does not always think itself to be different from those things which are not that which it itself is. Therefore, it is always difficult to distinguish in it the memory of itself from the understanding of itself. For it would almost seem as if they were not two things, but two different names for one and the same thing, since they are so closely united together in the mind, that the one does not precede the other in time. And love itself is not so plainly felt when the sense of need does not reveal its existence, since the object loved is always present. Wherefore, these things can be more plainly explained even to those who are slower of comprehension when we discuss those subjects that the mind learns in time, and which happen to it in time, since it remembers what it did not remember previously, sees what it did not see previously, and loves what it did not love previously.

But this treatise now calls for another beginning, because of the size of the present book.

Book 11

Outline

1. We must distinguish between the inner and the outer man. (1.1)
2. We must distinguish between the bodily object perceived, the vision, and the mind's attention. (2.2)
3. We do not distinguish during perception the form of the object and the form arising in sense. (2.3–5)
4. In memory there is this trinity: image, inner vision, and will that unites both. (3.6)
5. In a way, there are as many trinities in the mind as there are remembrances. (4.7–8.13)
6. It is impossible to form a concept of a color or sound or flavor one has never actually perceived. (8.15)
7. We can, however, make up mental images of objects we have never perceived. (9.16–11.18)

Chapter 1

No one doubts that, as the inner man is endowed with understanding, so the outer man is endowed with bodily sense.[1] Let us endeavor, therefore, to discover, if we can, any trace at all of the Trinity even in this outer man, not that he himself is also in the same way the image of God. For the teaching of the Apostle is clear, where he says that the inner man is being renewed in the knowledge of God according to the image of Him who created him [cf. *Colossians* 3:10]; and when he also says in another

[1] *sensus corporis.*

place: "Even though our outer man is decaying, yet our inner man is being renewed day by day" [*2 Corinthians* 4:16].

Let us, therefore, seek for some image of the Trinity in that which is decaying, insofar as we can, and even if this is not a clearer image, it may perhaps be easier to discern, for if it did not bear some resemblance to the inner man, there is no reason why it should even be called man. And by the very order of our condition, whereby we are made mortal and carnal, we apply ourselves more easily and, so to speak, more familiarly with visible than with intelligible things, since the former are external and the latter internal, and we perceive the former through the sense of the body, but the latter through the mind. And we, simply rational souls, are not perceptible by the senses,[2] that is, we are not bodies but intelligible beings, since we are life.

Yet, as I have said, our familiarity with bodies has become so great, and our thought[3] has projected itself outwardly with so wonderful a proclivity towards these bodies, that when it has been withdrawn from the uncertain realm of bodies and fixes its attention on the much more certain and more stable knowledge of the spirit, it again takes refuge in these bodies and seeks rest there from the place where it drew its weakness.

We must adjust ourselves to this weakness. If, then, we seek at any time to distinguish interior and spiritual things more aptly, and to intimate them more easily, we must take examples of likenesses from external and corporeal things. The outer man, therefore, endowed with bodily sense, perceives bodies, and this sense, as can be readily observed, is divided into five parts: sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch. But it would lead us too far, and moreover it is hardly necessary to question these five senses for that which we are seeking. For what one of them tells us also applies to all the rest. Let us, therefore, rely principally on the testimony of the eyes, for this sense of the body far excels the rest, and comes closer to mental vision,[4] though it differs from it in kind.

Chapter 2

(2) When we see a body we have to consider and to distinguish the following three things, and this is a very simple task: first, the object which we see, whether a stone, or a flame, or anything else that can be seen by the

[2] *nosque ipsi animi non sensibiles simus*. In a way the idea expressed here is very Cartesian, in a way it is anti-Cartesian. Descartes certainly agreed that the mind is not itself perceptible by the senses. But he insisted that the mind has nothing to do with life. (See the Introduction, note 11.)

[3] *intentio*. [4] *visioni mentis.*

eyes, and this could, of course, exist even before it was seen; secondly, the vision, which was not there before we perceived the object that was presented to the sense; thirdly, the power that fixes the sense of sight[5] on the object that is seen as long as it is seen, namely, the attention of the mind.[6] In these three, therefore, there is not only an evident distinction, but also a difference in nature. First of all, that visible object is of a far different nature from the sense of sight, which must come in contact with it for vision to take place. And that vision itself: does it appear as anything else than as the sense informed by the object that is perceived? Although there is no vision when the visible object is removed, nor indeed could there be any such vision at all if there were no body that could be seen, yet the body by which the sense of sight is formed, when that body is seen, is not at all of the same substance as the form itself, which is impressed by the very same body upon the sense and which is called "vision."

The body that is seen is in its own nature separable. But [consider] the sense that was already in the living being, even before it saw what it could see when it came upon something visible, or the vision which arises in the sense from that visible body when it is now combined with the sense and is seen; the sense, therefore, or the vision, that is, the sense formed from without, belongs to the nature of a living being, and is altogether different from that body which we perceive by seeing, and by which the sense is not formed so that there be sense, but that there be vision. For if the sense were not within us even before the visible things were presented to our sight, there would be no difference between us and the blind during such times as we see nothing, whether in the darkness or when our eyes are closed. But we differ from the blind in this, that there is in us even when we do not see, the organ by which we can see and which is called the "sense";[7] but it is not in them, and they are called blind for no other reason than because they are without it.

In like manner that attention of the mind,[8] which fixes the sense on that thing which we see and binds both together, differs by nature not only from that visible thing – it is mind,[9] whereas that is body – but also from the sense itself and the vision, since this attention is proper to the mind alone. But the sense of sight is called a sense of the body for no other reason than that the eyes themselves are also members of the body. And though the inanimate body does not experience any sensation, yet

[5] *sensus occulorum*. [6] *animi intentio*. [7] *sensus*.
[8] Or rational soul, *animi intentio*. [9] Or rational soul, *animus*.

the soul,[10] when it is mingled together with the body, does experience sensation through a bodily organ, and this same organ is called the sense.

Even when one is blinded by some bodily affliction, and the sense of sight is cut off and extinguished, yet the mind remains the same; and its attention, after the loss of sight, cannot, of course, direct the sense of the body outwardly towards a body, and unite with it in order to see it, and fix its gaze upon it when it is seen; nevertheless, the very effort indicates that, though the bodily sense has been removed, the attention itself could neither perish nor be diminished. For a certain desire of seeing remains intact, whether it can actually be realized or not. These three, therefore, the body that is seen, the vision itself, and the attention of the mind which unites both are clearly to be distinguished from one another, not only on account of the properties characteristic of each, but also on account of the difference in their natures.

(3) And since in this process, the sensation proceeds, not from that body which is seen, but from a living body that perceives, to which the soul is fitted together in some marvelous way of its own, yet the vision is produced by the body that is seen. That is to say, the sense itself is informed by it, so that it is no longer merely a sense which can remain intact even in darkness as long as the eyes are sound, but it is now also an informed sense which is called "vision." The vision, therefore, is produced by the visible thing, but not by it alone, but only if the one who sees is also present. Wherefore vision is produced both by the visible thing and the one who sees, but in such a way that the sense of sight as well as the intention of seeing and beholding come from the one who sees,[11] while that informing of the sense, which is called "vision," is imprinted by the body alone that is seen, namely, by some visible thing; if it is taken away, nothing more remains of the form which was in the sense while the thing that was seen was present. Nevertheless, the sense itself remains, which was even before it experienced any sensation, just as a trace is also in the water, as long as the body itself, which impresses it, is in it; when the body is taken away, there will be no trace, although the water that existed even before it received the form of the body remains. And, therefore, we cannot indeed say that

[10] *anima*.

[11] Augustine here gives expression to what is called his "active theory" of sense perception. In a famous, and somewhat puzzling passage in his early work, *De quantitate animae*, Augustine writes, "Perception is something undergone by the body *per se* that is not hidden from the soul [*non latens animam*]" (48). Augustine's idea, both in that passage and here, seems to be that the soul takes note of what the body undergoes.

the visible thing begets the sense, but it begets the form, as it were, its own likeness, which arises in the sense when we perceive anything by seeing.

We do not by the same sense distinguish the form of the body which we see and the form which arises from it in the sense of the one who sees because the connection between them is so close that there is no room for distinguishing them. But by our reason we conclude that it would have been utterly impossible to perceive anything, unless some image of the body that was seen arose in our sense.[12] For it does not follow that when a ring has been impressed on wax, no image of it has, therefore, been made because it is not seen, except when it has been separated. But since that which was made so that it can be seen remains after the separation from the wax, we are, therefore, easily persuaded that the form, impressed by the ring, was already in the wax, even before the ring was separated from it. But if the ring were dipped into a fluid, no trace of its image would appear after the removal of the ring. Yet our reason should not on that account fail to see that the form of the ring, produced from the ring, was in that fluid before the ring was removed, and is to be distinguished from that form which is in the ring; it was produced from the form of the ring, and will no longer remain when the ring is removed, even though the form of the ring remains, from which the form in the fluid was produced. And so you cannot suppose that the sense of sight does not have an image of the body that is seen, and as long as it is seen, just because the image does not remain when the body is removed. And yet this is the reason why it is so difficult to persuade people of more sluggish mind that the image of a visible thing is formed in our sense when we see it, and that this same form is vision.

(4) But perhaps anyone who pays attention to what I am going to say will not experience any such difficulty in this inquiry. When we look for a long time at any light, and then close our eyes, it usually happens that certain bright colors appear; they assume many different forms and the light shining from them grows dimmer and dimmer until they disappear altogether.[13] These are understood to be the remains of that form which was wrought in the sense when the shining body was seen, and that these changes also take place in them little by little, as it were step by step, while

12 This comment shows that Augustine is not a representationalist in sense perception. That is, he does not suppose that some representation of the object perceived is the direct or immediate object of perception, from which we would have to infer that there exists, in fact, some physical object that it represents. See the Introduction.

13 This is, of course, the phenomenon of the afterimage.

the light is fading away. For even the lattices of windows, if we happened to look at them, often appeared in these colors; thus it is evident that our sense is affected by the impressions made by that thing which was seen.

This form was also there while we were seeing, and it was even clearer and more distinct. But it was so closely united with the form of that thing we saw that it could not be discerned at all, and this was vision itself. Nay more, two visions are actually produced, since the tiny flame of the lamp is in some way doubled, as it were, by the divergent rays of the eyes, even though only one thing is seen. For the same rays shining from each eye are affected in their own way, since they are not allowed to be focussed evenly and conjointly on that body, so that one view alone may be produced by both of them. And, therefore, if we close one eye, we shall not see a double fire, but, as it actually is, one fire. But why that image, which was on the right side, is no longer seen when we close the left eye, and conversely, why that which was on the left side disappears when we close the right eye, is a tedious subject, and not at all necessary to investigate and discuss for the matter at hand.

As far as the question that we have proposed is concerned, it is sufficient to know that, unless some kind of an image quite similar to that which we had perceived arose in our sense, the form[14] of the flame would not be doubled according to the number of the eyes, since a certain manner of viewing has been used which can separate the converging rays of light. For as long as one eye is closed, then no matter what you do with the other one, whether you draw it down, press on it, distort it, there is no way in which you can form a double image of anything that is one.

(5) Since this is so, let us recall how these three, though differing in nature, may be fitted together into a kind of unity, namely, (i) the form of the body[15] that is seen, (ii) its image impressed on the sense, which is vision, or the sense informed, and (iii) the will of the soul which directs the sense to the sensible thing and keeps the vision itself fixed upon it. The first of these, that is, the visible thing itself, does not belong to the nature of a living being, except when we see our own body. But the second belongs to it in such a way that it arises in the body and through the body in the soul, for it arises in the sense, which is neither without the body nor without the soul. The third, however, is proper to the soul alone, because it is the will. Although the substances of these three, therefore, are so

[14] *species.* [15] *species corporis.*

diverse, yet they form together such a unity, that the first two, namely, the form of the body that is seen and its image which arises in the sense, that is, the vision, can hardly be separated from each other, except when reason intervenes as a judge.

The will possesses such power in uniting these two that it moves the sense to be formed to that thing which is seen, and keeps it fixed on it when it has been formed. And if it is so violent that it can be called love, or desire, or passion, it likewise exerts a powerful influence on the rest of the body of this living being. And where a duller and harder matter does not offer resistance, it changes it into a similar form and color. Note how easily the little body of the chameleon turns very easily into the colors that it sees. In other animals, whose bodily bulk does not lend itself so easily to such changes, the offspring usually show some traces of the passionate desires of their mothers, whatever it was that they gazed upon with great delight. For the more tender, and so to speak, the more formable the original seeds were, the more effectually and the more capably do they follow the inclination of their mothers' soul, and the phantasy that arose in it through the body upon which it looked with passion. There are numerous examples of this that could be mentioned, but one from the most trustworthy books will suffice: in order that the sheep and the she-goats might give birth to speckled offspring, Jacob had rods of various colors placed before them in the watering-troughs, to look at as they drank, during that period when they had conceived [cf. *Genesis* 30:37, 41].

Chapter 3

(6) The rational soul,[16] however, lives disgracefully when it lives according to the trinity of the outer man, that is, when it applies to those things which form the sense of the body from without – not the laudable will by which it refers them to some useful end, but the shameful desire by which it has clung to them. For even when the form of the body that was perceived corporeally has been taken away, yet a likeness of it remains in the memory, to which the will may again turn its gaze in order to be formed by it from within, as the sense was formed by the sensible body that was presented to it from without. And so that trinity arises from memory, inner vision, and the will, which unites both. And when these three are drawn together

[16] *anima rationalis*.

[*coguntur*] into unity, then from that combination [*coactu*] itself, they are called thought [*cogitatio*].[17]

In these three there is no longer any diversity of substance. For that sensible body is not there, which is wholly different from the nature of a living being; nor is the sense of the body formed there in order that vision may arise; nor does the will itself act so as to move the sense to be formed to the sensible body, and keep it fixed upon that body when it has been formed. But the place of that bodily form, which was perceived from without, is taken by the memory, retaining the form which the soul absorbs into itself through the bodily sense; and the vision that was without, when the sense was formed by a sensible body, is succeeded by a similar vision within, when the eye of the mind is formed from that which the memory retains and absent bodies are conceived; and the will itself, as it moved the sense to be formed to the body that was presented to it from without, and combined both of them when it had been formed, so in the act of remembering it causes the eye of the mind to turn back to the memory, in order that it may be formed by that which the memory retains, and that there may be a similar vision in thought.

In the same way, however, that reason distinguished between the visible form, by which the bodily sense was formed, and its likeness, which arose in the sense that was formed so that there might be vision (otherwise, they had been so closely united as to be regarded as wholly one and the same), so, too, that phantasy that arises when the mind thinks of the form of the body that it has seen, although it is made up of the likeness of the body that the memory retains, as well as of that which is formed from it in the eye of the mind that remembers, yet it so appears to be one and single that only the judgment of reason can discover that two things are there. We are thereby given to understand that what remains in the memory, even when we think it from some other source, is one thing, and that something else arises when we remember, that is, when we return to the memory and there find the same form. And if it were no longer there, then we would say that we had so forgotten it that we could no longer remember it at all. But if the eye of him who remembers were not formed by that thing which was in the memory, then the vision of thought could in no way take place. The combination of both, however, that is, of the image which the memory retains and that which was expressed by it in order that the eye

[17] According to Augustine the words "*cogo*," "*coactus*," and "*cogitatio*" come from the same root. He refers to the same etymological derivation of these words in *Confessions* 10.11.8.

of the one remembering might be formed, cause them to appear as only one because they are quite similar to each other.

When, however, the gaze of thought turns away and ceases to behold that which was seen in the memory, then nothing of the form that was impressed on it will remain in that same gaze, and it will be informed by that to which it had again turned, so as to form another thought. Yet there remains that which it has left in the memory, and to which it may again turn when we remember it, and it may be informed by it when it has turned to it, and become one with that from which it is informed.

Chapter 4

(7) Yet if that will, which continually moves the eye to be informed here and there and unites it when informed with its object, concentrates exclusively on that inner phantasy and turns the mind's eye completely away from the bodies which surround the senses and from the bodily senses themselves, and turns entirely to that image which it sees within itself, then it comes upon so striking a likeness of the bodily form, made clear from the memory, that not even reason itself can distinguish whether the body itself is seen without, or something of the kind is thought within. For at times men have been so allured or terrified by excessive thinking about visible things that they have even suddenly uttered cries, just as if they were actually in the midst of such actions and sufferings. I recall someone telling me that he was accustomed to perceiving in his thoughts the form of a woman's body, so distinct and, as it were, solid, that even his genital organs were aroused, as though he had experienced intercourse with her. So great is the power of the mind over its body, and so great its influence in turning and changing the quality of the [bodily] garment [it wears], just as a man decides how he is to be dressed by the garment he wears. And to this same category belong the images by which we are beguiled in sleep, since they also affect us in a similar way.[18]

It makes a very great difference whether the senses of the body are inactive as when people are asleep, or are disturbed from their inward structure as when they are in a frenzy, or are distracted in some manner as in the case

[18] In Book 12 of *De genesi ad litteram* Augustine makes his most determined effort to escape responsibility for "unchaste" dreams, an issue that seems to have concerned him throughout much of his priestly life. See Chapter 8, "The Moral Dream Problem," in *Thought's Ego in Augustine and Descartes*, Gareth B. Matthews, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992, 90–106.

of diviners and prophets, and so from one or the other cause the intention of the mind is forced by a kind of necessity upon these images, which are presented to it either by the memory or by some other secret force, through certain spiritual mixtures of a similar substance; or whether, as sometimes happens to those who are healthy and awake, that while engaged in the process of thinking, they turn their will away from the senses, and so inform the eye of the mind by various images of sensible things, just as though the sensible things themselves were actually experienced.

Yet these impressions of images are produced not only when the will is directed towards such things by desiring them, but also when the mind, in order to avoid them and to be on its guard against them, is impelled to look upon them so as to flee from them. Accordingly, not only desire but also fear causes the senses of the body to be informed by sensible things, and the eye of the mind by the images of sensible things. And, therefore, the more vehement the fear or the desire, the more clearly is the eye informed, whether in the case of him who experiences the sensation from the body that lies close to him in place, or in the case of him who conceives from the image of the body contained in his memory.

Therefore, what a body in a particular place is to the sense of the body, that the likeness of the body in the memory is to the eye of the mind; and what the vision of one seeing is to that form of the body from which the sense is informed, that the vision of one thinking is to the image of the body that is fixed in the memory, from which the eye of the mind is informed. And what the intention of the will is towards a body that is seen, and the vision to be combined with it in order that out of the three a kind of unity may arise there, even though they differ in nature, that the same intention of the will is towards combining the image of the body, which is in the memory, and the vision of thought, that is, the form which the eye of the mind has taken into itself when it turns to the memory. Thus here too a certain unity may be brought about from three, not now distinct by a difference in nature, but of one and the same substance, because this whole is within and this whole is mind.

Chapter 5

(8) But just as when the form and the species of the body[19] have perished, the will cannot recall to it the sense of perceiving, so when the image

[19] *forma et species corporis.*

which the memory bears has been blotted out by forgetfulness, the will is unable to turn back the eye of the mind by recollection in order that it may be informed thereby. But because the mind possesses the great power of forming images, not only of things that it has forgotten, but also of those that it has not felt or experienced, while enlarging, diminishing, changing, or arranging at its pleasure those things which have not slipped away, it often fancies that something is so and so, when it knows either that it is not so, or does not know that it is so. In such a case it must take care that it does not either lie so as to deceive, or hold an opinion so as to be deceived. If it avoids these two faults, the phantasies of the imagination do not harm it, just as sensible things that have been experienced and retained in the memory do no harm if one does not desire them passionately if they cause pleasure, or shamefully flee from them if they are unpleasant. But when the will renounces the better things and greedily wallows in these things, it becomes unclean; and so it is harmful to think of them when they are present, and more harmful to think of them when they are absent.

In this way the mind lives wickedly and shamefully according to the trinity of the outer man, because it was for the purpose of using sensible and corporeal things that it has also begotten that other trinity, which although it imagines within, yet imagines things that are from without. For no one could use these things, not even in a good way, unless the images of sensible things were retained in the memory, and unless the will for the most part dwells in the higher and more inward things, and unless the same will, which is adapted both to bodies without and to their images within, refers whatever it takes from them to a better and truer life, and rests in that end upon which it gazes, and for the sake of which it judges that these things ought to be done – what else do we do but that which the Apostle prohibits us from doing when he says: "Be not conformed to this world"? [*Romans* 12:2] Wherefore this trinity is not an image of God, for it is produced in the soul itself through the sense of the body from the lowest, that is, from the corporeal creature, to which the soul is superior.

Yet it is not wholly dissimilar; for what does not bear some likeness to God, according to its own kind and its own measure, seeing that God has made all things exceeding good [cf. *Ecclesiasticus* 39:21], precisely because He Himself is the highest good? Insofar, therefore, as anything is, it is good; that is, to that extent it bears some resemblance, though very remote, to the highest good; and if a natural likeness, then certainly right

and well-ordered, but if a defective likeness, then certainly shameful and perverse. For even in their very sins souls are only striving for a certain likeness to God in their proud, perverted, and so to speak, servile liberty. Thus our first parents could not have been persuaded to sin if it had not been said to them: "You shall be as gods" [*Genesis* 3:5]. Certainly, not everything in creatures that is in some way or other similar to God is also to be called His image, but that alone to which He Himself alone is superior; for the image is only then an expression of God in the full sense, when no other nature lies between it and God.

(9) Hence, the parent, as it were, of that vision, that is, of the form which arises in the sense of one who sees, is the form of the body[20] from which it arises. But yet the latter is not a true parent, and consequently the former is not a true offspring. For the vision is not completely begotten by the form of the body alone, since something else is applied to the body in order that it may be formed by it, namely, the sense of the one who sees. Wherefore to love this is to be estranged.[21] The will, therefore which combines both this quasi-parent and this quasi-offspring is more spiritual than either of the two. For that body which is seen is not at all spiritual. On the other hand the vision, which takes place in the sense, is indeed mingled with something spiritual, because it cannot take place without the soul. But the whole is not so, since that which is formed is a sense of the body. Hence, the will, which combines both, is known to be more spiritual, as I have said, and, therefore, it begins in this trinity to suggest as it were the person of the Spirit. But it belongs more to the sense that is formed than to that body whence it is formed.

The sense belongs to an animate being and the will to the soul, not to a stone or to any body that is seen. It does not proceed, therefore, from the body, as though this were its parent, nor from the vision or form, which is in the sense, as though it were its offspring. For before the vision arose, there already was a will which directed the sense to the body in order that it might be formed by seeing it; but yet it was not satisfied. For how could that satisfy which was not yet seen? But satisfaction means that the will is at rest. And, therefore, we cannot speak of the will as the quasi-offspring of the vision, because it was before the vision, nor as the quasi-parent,

[20] *forma corporis.*

[21] In *Retractations* 2.15 Augustine says that he is referring here only to those who are estranged from God because they love the created thing for itself alone, not to those whose love of created things redounds to the praise of their Creator.

because it was formed and expressed, not by the will, but by the body that was seen.

Chapter 6

(10) Perhaps we can rightly speak of seeing as the end and the repose of the will, at least as far as this one thing [i.e., this visible body] is concerned. For the will does not, therefore, will nothing else, merely because it now sees something that it willed. Hence, this is not at all the will itself of the man that has no other end except happiness, but a passing act of the will to see this one thing; and its only end is the seeing of it, whether it refers what it sees to something else, or whether it does not. If it merely wills to see, and does not refer what it sees to something else, there is no need to show how seeing is the end of the will, for this is evident. But if it refers it to another thing, then it certainly wills something else, and there will not now be merely a will to see, or if to see, not to see this particular thing.

It is just as if anyone wishes to see a scar in order to learn from it that there had been a wound; or if he wishes to see a window in order to see the passers-by through the window. All these and other such acts of the will have their own proper ends, which are referred to the end of that will, by which we wish to live happily and arrive at that life which is not referred to anything else, but is sufficient in itself for the lover. The will to see, therefore, has seeing as its end, and the will to see this thing has the seeing of this thing as its end. The will to see the scar, therefore, seeks for its own proper end, which is the seeing of the scar and does not reach beyond it. For the will to prove that there had been a wound is another act of the will, though it is dependent upon the former will, of which the end is likewise to prove that there had been a wound. And the will to see the window has as its end the seeing of the window, for the will to see the passers-by through the window is another act of the will, which is connected with the former, and its end is also the seeing of the passers-by.

All the wills that are bound to each other are good, if the end to which all are referred is good; but if it is bad, then all are bad. Therefore, the series of good wills that are joined together is a kind of road on which there are, as it were, certain steps for those ascending to happiness; but the entanglement of the bad and perverse wills is a chain by which he will be bound, who acts thus, in order that he may be cast into the outer darkness [cf. *Matthew* 22:13].

Blessed are they who by their deeds and conduct sing the canticle of the steps,[22] and woe to those who draw sins as a long rope [cf. *Isaiah* 5:18]. But we speak of the will at rest as an end, when it is still referred to something further, in the same way as we speak of a foot at rest in walking, when it is placed whence another may tread in order to follow a man's steps. But if something so pleases us that the will rests and finds some delight in it, yet this is not yet the end for which it is striving; but this, too, is referred to something further, so that it may be regarded not as his native land, but the resting place or even the lodging of a traveler.

Chapter 7

(11) In the other trinity, which is indeed more inward than the one in sensible things and in the senses, but yet has been conceived from there – in it the sense of the body is no longer informed from the body, but the eye of the mind from the memory, since the form of the body that we perceived without has inhered in the memory – in this trinity, therefore, we call the form, which is in the memory, the parent, as it were, of that which is wrought in the phantasy of thought. For it was in the memory even before it was conceived by us, just as the body was in place even before it was perceived, so that vision might take place. But when it is conceived, then from that form which the memory retains, there is impressed upon the gaze of thought and formed by the recollection that form [species] which is, as it were, the offspring of that which the memory retains. But yet even here the one is not a true parent, nor the other a true offspring.

For the gaze of the mind, which is formed from the memory, when we think of something in the process of remembering, does not proceed from that form [species] which we have seen and remembered, since we could not have remembered those things unless we had seen them. But the gaze of the mind, which is informed by recollection, existed also before we had seen the body which we remember, how much more so before we had committed it to memory? Hence, although the form, which arises in the gaze of one remembering, arises from that which is in the memory, yet the gaze itself does not arise from there, but existed before it. But it follows from this, that if the one is not a true parent, then the other is not a true offspring. Nevertheless, both that quasi-parent as well as that

[22] Perhaps a reference to the "Gradual Psalms" (119–33).

quasi-offspring suggest something from which we gain greater skill and certainty in the study of inner and truer things.

(12) Furthermore, it is more difficult to discern clearly whether the will, which unites the vision with the memory, is not the parent or the offspring of either one of them. The difficulty in distinguishing them is caused by the similarity and equality of the same nature and substance. For the sense informed from without can easily be distinguished from the sensible body, and the will from both of them, on account of the different nature which is present in all three, as we have discussed above at sufficient length. But here the distinction cannot be seen so easily. For though the trinity, which we are now seeking, is brought into the mind from without, yet it is completed within, and nothing in it lies outside the nature of the mind itself.

How can it be demonstrated, then, that the will is not, as it were, the parent, and not, as it were, the son, whether of the corporeal likeness which is contained in the memory, or of the image which is expressed by it in the process of recollection, when it so unites both of them in the thought that they appear singly as one and only reason can distinguish them? The first thing that we must consider is that there can only be a will to remember when we retain either the whole of that which we wish to remember or a part of it in the inner chambers of our memory. For if we have forgotten absolutely and completely, the will to remember does not even arise, since whatever we wish to remember, we have already remembered that it either is or was in our memory.

If, for instance, I wish to remember what I ate yesterday evening, I have already remembered either that I ate yesterday evening, or if I do not yet remember this, I have certainly remembered something that happened at this time; if nothing else, then, at least I remember yesterday and that part of it at which I generally eat supper, and what it means to eat supper. For if I remembered nothing of the kind, then I could not have the will to remember what I had eaten yesterday evening. From this we can conclude that the will to remember proceeds indeed from those thing which are contained in the memory, in addition to those things which, by the act of seeing, are copied from it through recollection; that is, it proceeds from the combination of something that we have remembered and the vision which took place from it, when we remembered, in the gaze of thought.

But the will itself, which combines both, also requires something further, something which is as it were near at hand and adjacent to the one

who remembers. Hence, there are as many trinities of this kind as there are remembrances, because there is not one of them where these three are not to be found: that which was hidden in the memory even before it is conceived, that which arises from it in the thought when it is perceived, and the will which combines both, and so from these two and itself as a third, it completes one single thing. Or should we rather consider it as only a single trinity of this kind, so that we may speak generally of all the corporeal forms hidden in the memory as a single unity, and again of the general vision of the mind that recalls such things and thinks of such things as a single unity, and to the combination of these two, the will which combines them would then be joined as a third, so that this whole would have a certain unity made up from three?

Chapter 8

Since the eye of the mind cannot behold everything together that the memory retains with a single glance, the trinities of thought are constantly changing; while some are coming, others are going, and so that trinity becomes innumerably most numerous; yet it is not infinite if it does not go beyond the number of things hidden in the memory. For if one were to reckon from the time he first began to perceive bodies through any sense of the body, and were even to add, if possible, those things which had been forgotten, the number would assuredly be certain and fixed, even though innumerable. For we speak not only of infinite things as innumerable, but also of those which are so finite that they surpass anyone's power of reckoning.

(13) But from this it can be seen a little more clearly that what is hidden and retained in the memory is one thing, and what is impressed by it in the thought of the one remembering is another thing, even though they appear to be one and the same thing when they are joined together. For we can remember only as many corporeal forms as we have perceived, how great they were and such as they were when we perceived them, since the mind absorbs them into the memory by means of the bodily sense; whereas the visions which take place in thought are drawn, it is true, from those things which are in the memory, yet they are multiplied and varied innumerably and altogether infinitely.

Thus, I remember only one sun, because I have also seen only one, as there is only one; yet, if I please, I can think of two or three suns, or

of as many as I will; but the vision in my mind when I think of many suns is formed from the same memory by which I remember the one sun. Furthermore, I remember it as just as large as I saw it. For if I remember it as larger or as smaller than that which I saw, then I no longer remember what I saw, and, therefore, I no longer remember it at all. But because I remember, I remember it just as large as I saw it; yet I can at will picture it to myself as larger or as smaller; and so I remember it just as I saw it; but, as I will, I think of it as running its course, and as standing still where I will, and as coming from where and to where I will. It is also easy for me to think of it as square, although I remember it as round. I likewise think of it as having any color I please, although I have never seen a green sun, and, therefore, I do not remember it; and as the sun, so all other things.

Since, however, these forms of things are corporeal and apparent to the senses, the mind is certainly in error when it imagines them as being without in the same way as they are conceived within, either when they have already perished without and are still retained in the memory, or when in any other way also, that which we remember is formed, not by the reliability of our memory, but by the changeableness of our thought.

(14) Yet it happens very frequently that we also believe those who narrate some true experiences which they themselves have perceived through their senses. And since we conceive these things narrated to us as we actually hear them, it does not seem as if the mind's eye turns back to the memory in order that visions may arise in our thoughts; for we do not conceive them by virtue of what we remember, but according to what another describes to us; thus that trinity does not seem to be completed here, which is brought to pass when the form hidden in the memory and the vision of the one remembering are combined together by the will as a third. For in this case, when something is narrated to me, I do not conceive that which is hidden in my memory, but that which I hear. I am not speaking of the actual words of the narrator, lest anyone should imagine that I have gone over to that other trinity which is completed without in sensible things and in the senses, but I am conceiving according to those corporeal forms which the narrator makes known to me by words and sounds; and certainly I conceive them not by remembering, but by hearing.

Even then, if we consider the matter more carefully, we do not go beyond the limits of the memory. For the only reason why I could understand what the narrator was saying, even though I then heard his words put together for the first time in a connected discourse, was because I remembered

generically the individual things that he described. For example, he who describes to me a mountain that is stripped of its forest and clothed with olive trees is speaking to one who remembers the forms of the mountains, the forests, and the olive trees; had I forgotten them, I should not at all know what he was saying, and, therefore, I could not conceive that description. And so it comes about that everyone who conceives corporeal things, whether he himself forms an image of them or whether he hears or reads what someone relates about the past or foretells about the future, returns to his memory and finds there the mode and the measure of all the forms that he beholds in his thoughts.

For it is impossible to form any concept at all of a color or of a bodily figure that one has never seen, or of a sound that one has never heard, or of a flavor that one has never tasted, or of an odor that one has never smelled, or of any touch of a corporeal object that one has never felt. If no one, accordingly, conceives anything corporeal unless he has perceived it, because no one remembers anything corporeal unless he has perceived it, then as the limit of perceiving is in bodies, so the limit of thinking is in the memory. For the sense receives the form from that body which we perceive, the memory receives it from the sense, but the gaze of thought receives it from the memory.

(15) Furthermore, just as the will applies the sense to the body, so it applies the memory to the sense, and the gaze of thought to the memory. But the same will, which brings them together and combines them, also divides and separates them. But it separates the senses of the body from the bodies that are to be perceived by a movement of the body, in order that we may not experience a sensation or that we may cease to experience it. For example, we avert our eyes from, or close them to, something that we do not wish to see; and in like manner we keep our ears from sounds, and our nostrils from odors. So by also closing our mouth, or by spitting out something that we do not wish, we turn away from tastes. As regards touch we also draw our body away lest we touch something that we do not wish, or push it aside or drive it away if we were already touching it. And so the will acts by a movement of the body in order that the sense of the body may not be combined with sensible things.

It acts thus insofar as it can. For when it meets with any hardship in an action of this kind on account of the condition of our servile mortality, then torment is the result, so that nothing is left to the will save endurance. But the will turns away the memory from the sense when it is intent on

something else, and does not allow things that are present to cling to it. This can be easily established; for, when someone is speaking to us and we are thinking of something else, it often appears as if we had not heard him. But this is not true; we did hear, but we did not remember, because the speaker's words slipped immediately away from the perception of our ears, being diverted elsewhere by a command of the will which is wont to fix them in the memory. And, therefore, when something of the kind occurs, it would be more correct to say, "We did not remember," rather than, "We did not hear."

For it happens even when reading – it has happened to me very often – that I have read through a page or a letter and did not know what I was reading, and so had to read it again. For when the attention of the will is centered on something else, then the memory is not so applied to the sense of the body as the sense itself is applied to the letters. So, too, people while walking, whose will is fixed on something else, do not know where they have got to; for if they had not seen, they would not have walked to this place, or they would have felt their way while walking with greater attention, especially if they passed through unknown places; but because they walked easily, they certainly saw; yet because the memory was not applied to the sense itself in the same way as the sense of the eyes was applied to the places through which they had passed, they could in no way recall even the last thing that they had seen. Hence, to wish to turn the gaze of the mind away from that which is in the memory means nothing else than not to think of it.

Chapter 9

(16) In this arrangement, therefore, when we begin with the bodily form, and finally arrive at the form that is formed in the gaze of thought,[23] four species are found; they are born, as it were, step by step, one from the other: the second from the first, the third from the second, and the fourth from the third. For the bodily form that is perceived produces the form that arises in the sense of the percipient; this latter gives rise to the form in the memory; finally, the form in the memory produces the form that arises in the gaze of thought. Hence, the will unites three times over, as it were, the parent with its offspring: first of all, the bodily form with that which

[23] *in contuitu cogitantis.*

it begets in the sense of the body; and this again with that which arises from it in the memory; and this also thirdly, with that which is born from it in the gaze of thought. But the intermediate combination, which is the second, although nearer to the first, is not as similar to it as the third is.

There are two visions, one of perception, the other of thought. But in order that this vision of thought may be brought about, something similar to it is wrought for this purpose in the memory from the vision of perception, to which the eye of the mind may turn itself in thinking in the same way, as the glance of the eyes turns itself in perceiving to the body. I have, therefore, chosen to mention two trinities of this kind; one, when the vision of perception is formed by the body, the other, when the vision of thought is formed by the memory. But I did not wish to explain the intermediate one because we usually do not speak of a vision there, since the form which arises in the sense of the one seeing is entrusted to the memory. But the will appears everywhere only as the unifier, so to speak, of the parent and the offspring. And for this reason it cannot be called either the parent or the offspring, no matter from where it may proceed.

Chapter 10

(17) Yet if we only remember what we have perceived, and only conceive what we have remembered, why do we so often conceive false things, since we certainly do not remember falsely those things which we have perceived, unless it be that that will – I have taken pains to show, insofar as I could, that it unifies and separates things of this kind – directs the gaze of the thought that is to be formed, just as it pleases through the hidden stores of the memory, and in order to conceive things which we do not remember, impels it to take from those that we do remember one thing from here and another thing from there; and so when these are all brought together into one vision, they result in something that is called false, either because it does not exist outside in the nature of corporeal things, or because it does not appear to be copied from the memory, since we have no recollection of having perceived such a thing?

Who, for instance, has ever seen a black swan? Therefore, no one remembers it. But who cannot imagine one? For it is easy to stain that figure, which we have come to know by seeing, with a black color, which we have seen nonetheless in other bodies, and because we have seen both, we remember both. I do not remember a four-footed bird because I have

never seen one, but it is very easy for me to contemplate such a phantasy. I simply add to some flying thing that I have seen, two other feet such as I have likewise seen. Therefore, while we conceive as bound together that which we remember to have perceived singly, we do not seem to conceive that which we remember; yet we actually do this under the direction of the memory from which we draw everything, and then arrange it in many different ways and shapes according to our will.

For we do not conceive the largeness of bodies which we have never seen without the aid of the memory. For to whatever extent of space our gaze reaches through the magnitude of the world, to that same extent do we enlarge the bulk of bodies, whatever they may be, whenever we conceive them to be as large as we can. And our reason in fact goes even further, but the phantasy does not follow; as when our reason proclaims the infinity of number, which no vision in the thought of corporeal things has yet grasped. The same reason teaches us that even the tiniest bodies can be divided infinitely; but when we have finally arrived at those slightest and most minute particles we have seen and still remember, we are no longer capable of gazing upon slighter and more minute phantasies, although our reason does not cease to go further and to divide them further. Thus we do not conceive corporeal things, except those which we remember or from some other things which we remember.

Chapter 11

(18) Yet because things which have been impressed on the memory singly can be conceived according to number, measure seems to belong to the memory, but number to the vision. For even though the multiplicity of such visions is innumerable, yet a limit has been fixed for each one in the memory beyond which it cannot go. Hence, the measure appears in the memory and the number in the visions, just as there is also a kind of measure in the visible bodies themselves to which the sense of those who see is adjusted most numerously, and the gaze of many spectators is formed from one visible object in such a way that even one person may generally see a double image of one thing because of the number of the eyes, as we have taught above.

Accordingly, there is some measure in those things from which the visions are copied, but in the visions themselves there is number. But the will which unites and arranges them, and binds them into a kind of unity,

and does not choose to rest its desire of perceiving and thinking except in those things from which the visions are formed, resembles a weight. Therefore, by way of anticipation, I would like to point out that these three, measure, number, and weight, are also found in all other things.

In the meantime I have now shown, as I could and to whom I could, that the will as the unifier of the visible object and the vision, as it were, of the parent and the offspring, whether it be in perceiving or in thinking, cannot be called the parent or the offspring. Therefore, time admonishes us to seek this same trinity in the inner man, and to endeavor to proceed within, from the animal and carnal man, of whom I have been speaking for so long, who is called the outer man. We hope to be able to find there a trinity which is an image of God. He Himself will aid our efforts; He, of whom as the things themselves indicate, so also the Sacred Scripture testifies that He has ordered all things in measure, number and weight [*Wisdom* 11:21].

Book 12

Outline

1. Whatever we have in common with beasts belongs to the outer man, reason to the inner man. (1.1–2.2)
2. Reason deals both with temporal things, and with eternal things. (3.3–4.4)
3. Both male and female were created in the image of God. (5.5–11.16)
4. It is less sinful to take pleasure in the thought of doing evil things one decides not to do. (12.17–13.21)
5. We must distinguish between wisdom (s*apientia*), which concerns eternal things, and knowledge (*scientia*), which concerns the temporal. (14.21–23)
6. We should reject the Platonic doctrine of recollection and believe rather that the intellectual mind is so formed to see the forms in the light of reason. (15.24–25)

Chapter 1

Well now! Let us see where the boundary line, so to speak, between the outer and the inner man is to be placed. For it is correctly said that whatever we have in our soul in common with the beasts pertains to the outer man, since by "outer man" we mean not the body alone, but also its own peculiar kind of life, from which the structure of the body and all the senses derive their vigor and by which they are equipped to perceive external things. And we are still concerned with something pertaining to the outer man when the images of things that have already been perceived and have been fixed in our memory are again seen through recollection.

And in all these things we do not differ from the beasts, except that our bodily figure is not bent over but erect. We are thereby admonished by Him who made us that we should not be like the animals in our better part, that is, in our mind,[1] from whom we are different by the erectness of our body. Not that we should throw our mind into those things which are more sublime in bodies, for even to desire the repose of the will in such things is to degrade the mind. But just as the body by its own nature is lifted up to those bodily things that are most exalted, that is to heavenly things, so the mind, which is a spiritual substance, should be lifted up to the most exalted in spiritual things, not by the elation of pride, but by the piety of justice.

Chapter 2

(2) Even beasts can perceive corporeal things outwardly through the senses of the body, can recall them when they are fixed in the memory, can seek for what is beneficial in them, and flee from what is unpleasant. But to make note of them, to retain them not only as caught up naturally, but also as deliberately committed to the memory, and to impress them again by recollection and reflection, when they are gradually slipping away into forgetfulness, in order that, as the thought is formed from that which the memory bears, so too this very same thing, which is in the memory, may be firmly fixed in thought, to combine also imaginary visions by taking pieces of recollection from here and there and, as it were, sewing them together, to see how in this kind of things the probable differs from the true, and this not in spiritual but in corporeal things themselves – these and similar operations, although performed in sensible things, and in those which the mind has drawn from them through the sense of the body, are yet not lacking in reason, nor are they common to men and beasts.

But it is the province of the superior reason to judge of these corporeal things according to incorporeal and eternal reasons which, if they were not above the human mind, would certainly not be unchangeable. Yet unless something of our own were subjoined to them, we should not be able to employ them as standards by which to judge of corporeal things. But we judge of corporeal things according to the standard of dimensions and figures which, as the mind knows, remain unchangeable.[2]

[1] *animus*, rational soul or mind.
[2] Here Augustine introduces the idea that the human mind has the power to apprehend directly the objects of reason. This topic runs through Book 12.

Chapter 3

(3) That part of us, however, which is thus concerned with the treatment of corporeal and temporal things, in that it is not common to us and beasts, is indeed rational, but is drawn, as it were, out of that rational substance of our minds, by which we depend upon and adhere to the intelligible and unchangeable truth, and which is assigned to handle and to direct the inferior things. For just as among all the beasts, a help like unto himself was not found for man, unless one were taken from himself and formed into his consort, so for our mind, by which we consult the superior and inner things, for such employment of corporeal things as the nature of man requires, no help like unto itself was found in the parts of the soul which we have in common with the beasts.

And, therefore, a certain part of our reason, not separated so as to sever unity, but diverted, as it were, so as to help fellowship, is set aside for the performing of its own proper work. And just as in man and woman there is one flesh of two, so the one nature of the mind embraces our intellect and action, or our council and execution, or our reason and reasonable appetite, or whatever other more significant terms there may be for expressing them, so that as it was said of those: "They shall be two in one flesh" [*Genesis* 2:24], so it can be said of these: "Two in one mind."[3]

Chapter 4

(4) We are, therefore, only discussing a single thing when we discuss the human mind;[4] nor do we double it into these two things that I have mentioned, except in regard to its functions. Hence, when we seek a trinity in it, we seek it in the whole mind; nor do we separate the action of reason in temporal things from the contemplation of eternal things, in order that we may then seek some third thing by which the trinity will be completed. But we ought so to seek a trinity in the whole nature of the mind, that even if there be no action at all upon temporal things – help is needed to do this work and, therefore, a part of the mind is diverted to handle these inferior things – yet a trinity may still be found in the one mind that is nowhere divided. When this distribution has already been made, then in that part alone, to which belongs the contemplation of eternal things, there is not only a trinity but also an image of God; but in that which has

[3] *duo in mente una.* [4] *mentis humanae.*

been diverted to the action upon temporal things, even if a trinity can be found, yet it cannot be an image of God.

Chapter 5

(5) Accordingly, they do not seem to me to offer a probable opinion who believe that, with regard to human nature, the trinity of the image of God in three persons can be so found as to be completed in the marriage of the man and woman with their offspring; in that the man himself suggests, as it were, the person of the Father; what has so proceeded from him so as to be born, the person of the Son; and thus, they say, the third person, as it were of the Spirit, would be the woman who so proceeded from the man as to be neither his son nor his daughter [cf. *Genesis* 2:22], although the offspring was borne by her conception. For the Lord said of the Holy Spirit, that He proceeds from the Father [cf. *John* 15:26], and yet that He is not His Son.

In the error of this opinion, therefore, the only point which is alleged with some probability, in regard to the original creation of the woman, and which is sufficiently shown according to the faith of Holy Scripture, is that not everything that comes into existence from one person so as to make another person can be called a son, since the person of the woman exists from the person of the man, and yet she is not called his daughter.

Yet all the other statements are indeed so absurd, nay so false, that they can be refuted very easily. For I omit such a thing as to regard the Holy Spirit as the mother of the Son of God and the spouse of the Father; for it will perhaps be answered that these things offend us in carnal matters by arousing thoughts of corporeal conceptions and births. Although the clean, to whom all things are clean, also think of these very things most chastely, yet to the unclean and unbelievers, whose mind and conscience are defiled, nothing is clean [cf. *Titus* 1:15], so that even Christ, born from the Virgin according to the flesh, scandalizes certain ones among them. But yet when considering those supreme spiritual things, in the likeness of which those kinds of the inferior creature have also been made, although most remotely, where nothing is defiled or corruptible, nothing born in time, nothing formed from a formless mass, or whatever similar expressions may be employed; yet they ought not to disturb the sober prudence of anyone, lest in avoiding a vain disgust he stumble into a pernicious error.

Let him so accustom himself to find traces of spiritual things in material things that, when he shall begin to ascend upwards from them under the guidance of reason, he may arrive at that unchangeable truth itself through which all things have been made, and may not take with him to the highest things that which he loathes in the lowest things. For a certain man was not ashamed to choose wisdom as his wife, just because the name "wife" suggests the thought of corruptible intercourse in the birth of offspring, or because wisdom itself is a woman in sex, since the word to designate it both in the Greek and Latin language is of the feminine gender.[5]

Chapter 6

(6) We do not reject this opinion, therefore, because we shun the thought that the holy, inviolable, and unchangeable Charity is, as it were, the spouse of God the Father, existing as it does from Him, but not as an offspring in order to beget the Word through which all things have been made, but because the Divine Scripture clearly shows it to be false. For God said: "Let us make man in our image and likeness," and a little later it was said: "And God made man in the image of God" [*Genesis* 1:26–27]. It would certainly be incorrect to say "our," because it is a plural number, if man were made according to the image of one person, whether of the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit; but because he was made in the image of the Trinity it was, therefore, said: "in our image." But again, in order that we might not think that we are to believe in three gods in the Trinity, since the same Trinity is the one God, it was said: "And God made man in the image of God," which is just the same as saying "in His image."

(7) For such expressions are customary in these Scriptures; yet there are some who, though they profess the Catholic faith, do not consider them carefully. And they think that when it is said: "God made in the image of God," it is just as though it were said: "God made in the image of the Son"; and they wish to prove from this, that the Son has also been called God in the Sacred Scriptures, just as though there were no other most true and clear testimonies, where the Son has not only been called God, but also the true God.

For while they are intent upon solving another difficulty in this statement, they become so entangled that they are unable to extricate

[5] Greek: *sophia*; Latin: *sapientia*.

themselves. For if the Father made in the image of the Son, so that man is not the image of the Father but of the Son, then the Son is unlike the Father. But if the pious faith teaches, as it does teach, that the Son is like the Father even to the equality of essence,[6] then it necessarily follows that what has been made in the likeness of the Son has also been made in the likeness of the Father. Furthermore, if the Father did not make in His own image but in to that of the Son, why did He not say: "Let us make man according in thy image and likeness," but did say "according to our image" – unless it be that the image of the Trinity was made in man, so that man should in this way be the image of the one true God, because the Trinity itself is the one true God?

While there are numberless instances of such expressions in the Scriptures, it will suffice for our purpose to cite the following. Thus it is said in the Psalms: "Salvation is of the Lord, and thy blessing upon thy people" [cf. *Psalm* 3:8], as if it were said to another and not to Him of whom He had said: "Salvation is of the Lord." And again: "By thee." He said, "I shall be delivered from temptation, and hoping in my God I shall leap over the wall" [cf. *Psalm* 18:29], as if He had said to another: "By thee I shall be delivered from temptation." And again: "Under thee shall the people fall in the heart of the king's enemies" [cf. *Psalm* 44:5], as if He had said: "in the heart of thy enemies." For He had said to that king, that is, to our Lord Jesus Christ: "Under thee shall the people fall," and He meant this king to be understood when He said: "in the heart of the king's enemies."

Testimonies of this kind are found more rarely in the writings of the New Testament. But yet the Apostle says to the Romans: "Concerning his Son, who was made to him of the seed of David, according to the flesh, who was predestinated the Son of God in power, according to the spirit of sanctification, by the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead" [cf. *Romans* 1:3–4], just as if he had spoken above about someone else. For what is the Son of God, predestinated by the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, if not the same Jesus Christ who was predestinated the Son of God in power? Therefore, just as when we hear here: "The Son of God in the power of Jesus Christ," or "The Son of God according to the spirit of sanctification of Jesus Christ," or "The Son of God by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead," when he

[6] *essentia*.

could have said in the customary way "in his power," or "according to the spirit of His sanctification," or "by the Resurrection from His dead," or "from their dead," we are not compelled to understand another person, but the one and the same person, namely, the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ; so when we hear: "God made man in the image of God," although it could have been said, according to more common usage, "in His image," yet we are not compelled to understand another person in the Trinity, but one and the same Trinity itself, who is the one God, and in whose image man has been made.

(8) Since this is so, and if we are to accept the same image of the Trinity, not in one man but in three human beings, the father, the mother, and the son, then the man was not made in the image of God before a wife was made for him and before they brought forth a son, because there was not yet a trinity. Or will someone perhaps say: "There already was a trinity, for though it did not yet exist in its proper form, yet in their original nature the woman was in the side of the man and the son in the loins of the father." Why, then, when Scripture had said: "God made man in the image of God," did it go on to say: "God made him; male and female made he them, and blessed them"? [cf. *Genesis* 1:27–28]. Or if this passage is to be divided thus: "And God made man," so that it is then to be added: "In the image of God he made him," and then subjoined in the third place: "male and female he made them." For some have been afraid to say: "God made him male and female," lest something monstrous, as it were, should be understood, such as those whom they call hermaphrodites, even though in this case the singular number could also be correctly understood of both, because of what was said "two in one flesh."

Why, then, as I began to say, does Scripture make no mention except of male and female in the nature of man that has been made in the image of God? For to complete the image of the Trinity the son should also be added, even though he was still placed in the loins of his father, as the woman was in his side. Or perhaps the woman, too, was already made, and Scripture has combined in a summary statement that of which it will explain more carefully later on, how it was done, and for this reason could not mention the son because he was not yet born? As if the Holy Spirit, who was later to describe the birth of the son in its proper place, could not have also included it in this brief account, just as He afterwards spoke about the woman in the proper place, who was taken from the side of the

man [cf. *Genesis* 2:24, 22], and yet has not failed to make mention of her here.

Chapter 7

(9) We ought, therefore, not to understand man as made in the image of the exalted Trinity, that is, in the image of God, in such a way that the same image is understood to be in three human beings; especially since the Apostle says that the man is the image of God, and consequently should remove the covering from his head, which he warns the woman to use, when he speaks as follows: "A man indeed ought not to cover his head, because he is the image and glory of God. But the woman is the glory of the man" [*1 Corinthians* 11:7].

What, then, is to be said about this? If the woman according to her own person completes the image of the Trinity, why is the man still called that image when she has been taken from his side? Or if even one human person out of three can be called the image of God, as each person in the exalted Trinity itself is also God, why is not the woman also the image of God? For this is also the reason why she is commanded to cover her head, which he is forbidden to do because he is the image of God [cf. *1 Corinthians* 11:7, 5].

(10) But we must see how the words spoken by the Apostle, that not the woman but the man is the image of God, are not contrary to that which is written in Genesis: "God made man, in the image of God he made him; male and female he made them and blessed them." For he says that human nature itself, which is complete in both sexes, has been made in the image of God, and he does not exclude the woman from being understood as the image of God. For after he had said that God made man in the image of God, he went on to say: "He made him male and female," or at any rate (if we punctuate this passage differently) "male and female he made them." In what sense, therefore, are we to understand the Apostle, that the man is the image of God, and consequently is forbidden to cover his head, but the woman is not, and on this account is commanded to do so? The solution lies, I think, in what I already said when discussing the nature of the human mind, namely, that the woman together with her husband is the image of God, so that that whole substance is one image. But when she is assigned as a helpmate, a function that pertains to her alone, then

she is not the image of God; but as far as the man is concerned, he is by himself alone the image of God, just as fully and completely as when he and the woman are joined together into one.

As we said of the nature of the human mind, if as a whole it contemplates the truth, it is the image of God; and when its functions are divided and something of it is diverted to the handling of temporal things, nevertheless that part which consults the truth is the image of God, but that other part, which is directed to the handling of inferior things, is not the image of God. And since the more it has extended itself towards that which is eternal, so much the more is it formed thereby to the image of God, and on that account it is not to be restrained so as to hold itself back and refrain from thence; therefore, the man ought not to cover his head.

Yet because an all too great advance towards the inferior things is dangerous to that rational knowledge which is concerned with corporeal and temporal things, it ought to have a power over its head; this is indicated by the veil which signifies that it ought to be kept in check. A sacred and pious meaning is pleasing to the holy angels. For God does not see things according to the measure of time, nor is anything new wrought in His vision and knowledge when anything temporal and transitory takes place in the way that the senses are affected by such things, whether the carnal senses of animals and men, or even the heavenly senses of the angels.

(11) That the Apostle Paul intended by this distinction between the male and the female sex to signify the mystery of a more hidden truth can be understood from this, that he says in another place that she is indeed a widow, who is desolate, without sons and nephews, and yet that she ought to trust in the Lord and continue in prayers night and day [cf. *1 Timothy* 5:5]. He here indicates that the woman having been seduced and brought into transgression will be saved through childbearing, and then he has added: "If they shall continue in faith and love and holiness with sobriety" [*1 Timothy* 2:15]. As if it could possibly harm a good widow if she did not have any children, or if those whom she had did not wish to continue in good works!

Yet because those which are called good works are, as it were, the sons of our life, according to the sense in which it is asked, what is a man's life? That is, how does he conduct himself in temporal things? (This life the Greeks called not *zôê* but *bios*) and because these good works are wont

to be practiced chiefly in the offices of mercy, but the works of mercy profit nothing either to the pagans or to the Jews, who do not believe in Christ, or to any heretics or schismatics, in whom faith, charity, and sober holiness are not found, what the Apostle meant to signify is evident, and it is expressed figuratively and mystically because he was speaking about the veiling of the woman's head, which will remain an empty precept unless it is referred to some hidden mystery.

(12) For as not only the most true reason, but also the authority of the Apostle himself declares, man was made in the image of God, not according to the form of the body, but according to the rational mind. For it is a vain and degrading thought which represents God as circumscribed and limited by the outlines of corporeal members. Moreover, does not this same blessed Apostle say: "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, him who is created according to God" [*Ephesians* 4:23–24], and even more plainly in another place: "Stripping yourselves of the old man with his deeds, put on the new, who is renewed unto the knowledge of God according to the image of him that created him"? [cf. *Colossians* 3:9–10]. If, therefore, we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and it is precisely the new man who is renewed unto the knowledge of God, according to the image of Him who created him, then no one can doubt that man has been made to the image of Him who created him, not according to the body, nor according to any part of the mind, but according to the rational mind where the knowledge of God can reside.

Yet according to this renewal we are also made the sons of God through the Baptism of Christ, and when we put on the new man, we certainly put on Christ through faith. Who is it, then, that would exclude women from this fellowship, since they are with us co-heirs of grace, and since the same Apostle says in another place: "For you are all children of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For whoever have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor freeman, there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus" [cf. *Galatians* 3:26–28]. Have the believing women, therefore, lost their bodily sex?

Yet because they are renewed there to the image of God, where there is no sex, man is made there in the image of God, where there is no sex, namely, in the spirit of his mind. Why, then, is the man on that account not bound to cover his head because he is the image and glory of God,

but the woman must cover it because she is the glory of the man, just as if the woman were not renewed in the spirit of her mind, who is renewed unto the knowledge of God according to the image of Him who created him? But because she differs from the man by her bodily sex, that part of the reason which is turned aside to regulate temporal things could be properly symbolized by her corporeal veil; thus the image of God does not remain except in that part of the mind of man in which it clings to the contemplation and consideration of the eternal reasons, which, as is evident, not only men but also women possess.

Chapter 8

(13) Therefore, in their minds a common nature is recognized; but in their bodies the division of this one mind itself is symbolized. As we, therefore, ascend inwardly by certain steps of thought through the parts of the soul, there where something begins to take place that is not common to us and beasts, from there reason begins, where the inner man can now be recognized. But if this inner man himself, through that reason to which the administering of temporal things has been delegated, proceeds too far by an uncontrolled progress into external things, and if his head gives its consent, that is, if that which presides as the masculine part in the watch-tower of counsel does not check and restrain it, then the inner man grows old among his enemies [*Psalm* 6:7], namely, the devils with the prince of devils, who are envious of virtue; and that vision of eternal things is likewise withdrawn from the head itself, which in company with its spouse eats what is forbidden, so that the light of its eyes is not with it [*Psalm* 38:10]. And thus, both being naked by that enlightenment of the truth, and the eyes of their conscience having been opened to see how shameful and unsightly they have been left, like the leaves of sweet fruits but without the fruits themselves. They weave together good words without the fruit of good work so as, while living wickedly, to cover their disgrace as it were by speaking well [cf. *Genesis* 3:4].

Chapter 9

(14) For when the soul loves its own power, it slips from the common whole to its own particular part. Had it followed God as its ruler in the universal creation, it could have been most excellently governed by His

laws. But in that apostatizing pride, which is called "the beginning of sin" [*Ecclesiasticus* 10:15], it sought for something more than the whole; and while it struggled to govern it by its own laws, it was thrust into caring for a part, since there is nothing more than the whole; and so by desiring something more, it becomes less, and for this reason covetousness is called "the root of all evils" [*1 Timothy* 6:10]. The efforts by which it urges its own interests against the whole, and against the laws by which the whole is governed, are made through its own body, which it possesses as part of the whole; and so, having found its delights in those corporeal forms and movements, since it cannot have them with it within itself, it becomes entangled with their images, which it has fixed in its memory, and is foully defiled by the fornication of the phantasy. It refers all its functions towards those ends for which it inquisitively seeks corporeal and temporal things through the senses of the body, or by its inflated pride it affects to be more exalted than other souls that are given up to the bodily senses, or it is immersed in the muddy whirlpool of carnal pleasure.

Chapter 10

(15) When the soul, therefore, consults, with a good will, either itself or others for the purpose of perceiving inward and superior things that are possessed in a chaste embrace, not privately but commonly, without any narrowness or envy by all who love such things, even though it may err in something through its ignorance of temporal things because it also directs these things in a temporal way, and may not observe the manner of acting that it should, this is a human temptation. And it is a great thing so to spend this life, along which we walk as those returning home, that no temptation may take hold of us except such as is human [cf. *1 Corinthians* 10:13]. For this sin is outside of the body, nor is it regarded as fornication, and on that account is forgiven most easily.

But when it does anything in order to obtain those things which are perceived through the body because of its lust for experiencing them, excelling in them, or handling them, so that it places the end of its own good in those things, then whatever it does, it does shamefully; it commits fornication, sinning against its own body [cf. *1 Corinthians* 6:18]. It does this while it snatches the deceptive images of corporeal things from within and combines them together by empty thought, so that nothing seems to it to be divine unless it be of such a kind as this; covetous of its own selfish

possessions it becomes prolific in errors and, prodigal of its own selfish goods, it is emptied of strength. Yet it would not leap all at once from the beginning into such a shameful and degrading fornication, but as it is written: "Whoever disdains small things shall fall by little and little" [*Ecclesiasticus* 19:1].

Chapter 11

(16) For as a snake creeps along, not with great strides, but by the most minute movements of its scales, so the slippery movement of falling away [from the good] takes possession of the careless little by little; and while it begins with the perverse desire of becoming like God, it arrives at a likeness to the beasts. So it is that they who were stripped of their first garment earned by their mortality coats of skin [cf. *Genesis* 3:21]. For the true honor of man is to be the image and the likeness of God, which likeness is preserved only by relation to Him from whom it is imprinted. Hence he clings to God so much the more, the less he loves what is his own. But through the desire of proving his own power, man by his own will falls down into himself, as into a sort of center. Since he, therefore, wishes to be like God subordinate to no one, then as a punishment he is also driven from the center, which he himself is, into the depths, that is, into those things in which the beasts delight; and thus, since the likeness to God is his honor, the likeness to the beasts is his disgrace. "Man placed in honor did not understand; he is compared to senseless beasts, and is become like to them" [cf. *Psalm* 49:12].

Along what road, then, could he pass so great a distance from the highest to the lowest, except along that which leads him to himself as the center? For when he neglects the love of wisdom which always stays the same and lusts after knowledge derived from experience with changeable things; it puffs up but does not edify [cf. *1 Corinthians* 8:1]. Thus the overburdened soul[7] falls as it were by its own weight from blessedness, and through that trial of itself as the center, it learns by its punishment what the difference is between the good that it has abandoned and the evil that it has committed; and since its own powers have been dissipated and lost, it cannot return except by the grace of its Creator, who calls it to penance and forgives its sins. For who shall deliver the unhappy soul from the body of this death,

[7] *animus*, rational soul or mind.

except the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord? [*Romans* 7:24–25] We shall discuss this grace, insofar as He shall grant, in its proper place.

Chapter 12

(17) Insofar as the Lord grants His help, let us now complete the study that we have undertaken of that part of reason to which knowledge[8] belongs, namely, the cognition of temporal and changeable things that is necessary for managing the affairs of this life. In that visible marriage of the two human beings who were the first to be made, the serpent did not eat of the forbidden tree, but only persuaded [others] to eat; and the woman did not eat alone, but also gave to her husband and both ate together, even though she alone spoke to the serpent, and she alone was seduced by him [cf. *Genesis* 3:1–6]. So too in that hidden and secret marriage, which also takes place and can be discerned in a single human being, the carnal, or as I should say, sensual movement of the soul which is directed to the senses of the body, and which is common to us and to beasts, has been excluded from the reason of wisdom.

For corporeal things are perceived by the sense of the body, but the eternal and unchangeable spiritual things are understood by the reason of wisdom.[9] Yet the reason of knowledge[10] has appetite very near to it, seeing that what is called the knowledge of action reasons about the corporeal things themselves that are perceived by the sense of the body. If it reasons well, it does so that it may refer that knowledge to the end of its highest good; but if badly, it is in order that it may rejoice, as it were, in such goods in which it rests in a false happiness.

Whenever that carnal or animal sense, therefore, forces upon the intention of the mind,[11] which uses the living force of reason in temporal and corporeal things for the purpose of carrying out its functions, some inducement to enjoy itself, that is, to enjoy itself just as in some private and personal good and not as in a public and common good, which is an unchangeable good, then the serpent, as it were, addresses the woman. But to consent to this inducement is to eat of the forbidden tree. If this consent, however, is limited to the mere pleasure of thought, but the members are so restrained by the authority of the higher counsel so as not to be offered as weapons of iniquity unto sin [cf. *Romans* 6:13], then

[8] *scientia.* [9] *sapientia.* [10] *scientia.* [11] *intentio mentis.*

it is to be so regarded, I believe, as if the woman alone had eaten the forbidden food. But if in the consent to use badly things that are perceived by the senses of the body and any sin is so far decided upon as to be also accomplished by the body, if that is possible, then it is to be understood that that woman has given to her husband so that he together with her might eat the forbidden food. For the mind cannot decide both that a sin is to be thought of with pleasure and also to be carried into effect, unless that intention of the mind which wields the sovereign power of moving the members to action or of restraining them from action also yields to and becomes the slave of the evil deed.[12]

(18) If the mind finds pleasure in only thinking of unlawful things, and decides in fact that they are not to be done, but yet with pleasure holds onto and ponders what should have been cast aside as soon as it touched the mind, then certainly we ought not to deny that there has been sin, but it is much less than if it had been decided to complete the thought in action. And, therefore, we should also ask pardon for such thoughts, and we should strike our breasts and say: "Forgive us our debts," and then do what follows and is added in the prayer: "as we also forgive our debtors" [*Matthew* 6:12].

For it is not so as with those first two human beings, each of whom was his own person, and, therefore, if the woman alone had eaten the forbidden food, she alone would certainly have suffered the penalty of death; so it cannot, I repeat, be said now of a single human being that, if the thought alone be willingly fed with unlawful pleasures from which it should at once turn away, even though it decides that the evil deeds are not to be done, but only retains the sweet remembrance of them, the woman, as it were, can be condemned without the man. Far be it from us to believe this! For this is one person, this is one human being, and he shall be condemned as a whole, unless those things which are perceived to be sins of thought alone, without the will of carrying them into effect, but yet with the will of delighting the mind with them, are forgiven through the grace of the Mediator.

(19) In this explanation, therefore, we have sought a certain rational marriage between contemplation and action in the mind of each individual man, since the functions are divided between these two, while the unity

[12] Augustine here states his intentionalist view of sin, and hence, of ethics more generally. See W. Mann, "Inner-Life Ethics," in *The Augustinian Tradition*, ed. Gareth B. Matthews, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999, 140–65.

of the mind is preserved in both. It also adheres to the historical truth of that account which the divine authority hands down about the first two human beings, namely, the man and the woman, from whom the whole human race is propagated. But it need only be listened to, insofar as it helps us to understand that the Apostle intended something to be sought in each individual human being, though as regards the different sex of the two human beings, he assigns the image of God only to the man, and not to the woman.

Chapter 13

(20) Nor does it escape me that certain ones, who were before us excellent champions of the Catholic faith and interpreters of the divine word when they sought these two things in a single human being whose whole soul they regarded as an excellent paradise, spoke of the man as the mind,[13] but the woman as the sense of the body. And according to this distribution, by which the man is represented as the mind, but the woman as the sense of the body, all things seem to fit together harmoniously, if they are treated with due attention, except for this: it is written that a helpmate like unto the man was not found among all the beasts and flying creatures, and then the woman was made from his side [cf. *Genesis* 2:20–22].

For this reason I have thought that the sense of the body should not be taken for the woman, since we see that it is common to us and beasts, and have preferred to take something which the beasts do not have, and have believed that it is more appropriate for the serpent to be understood as the sense of the body, who, as we read, was more subtle than all the beasts of the earth [cf. *Genesis* 3:1]. For among all those natural goods which, as we see, are common to us and irrational animals, the sense excels by a kind of living power, not that sense of which it is written in the Epistle to the Hebrews where we read: "solid food is for the perfect, who by custom have their senses exercised to the discerning of good and evil" [cf. *Hebrews* 5:14]. For these are the senses of the rational nature and pertain to the intelligence, but that is the five-fold sense of the body by which the corporeal species and movement are perceived, not only by us but also by the beasts.

(21) But whether the saying of the Apostle, that the man is the image and the glory of God but the woman is the glory of the man [cf. *1 Corinthians* 11:7], is to be understood in the former or latter sense, or in some other

[13] *mens*.

way, it is obvious that when we live according to God, our mind, intent on His invisible things, must be formed continuously by His eternity, truth, and love; yet a part of our reasonable attention, that is, a part of this same mind must be directed to the use of changeable and corporeal things, without which this life does not continue, not in order that we may be conformed to this world [cf. *Romans* 12:2] by placing our final end in such goods and in directing our desire for happiness towards them, but that whatever we do in the use of temporal things under the guidance of reason, we do it with our gaze fixed on the eternal things which we are to obtain, passing quickly by the former, but clinging to the latter.

Chapter 14

For knowledge, too, has its good limit if that which in it puffs up, or is wont to puff up, is overcome by the love for eternal things which does not puff up but, as we know, edifies [cf. *1 Corinthians* 8:1]. For without knowledge we cannot even possess the very virtues by which we live rightly and by which this miserable life is so regulated that it may arrive at that eternal life which is truly blessed.

(22) But there is a difference between the contemplation of eternal things and the action by which we use temporal things well; the former is called wisdom,[14] the latter knowledge.[15] For though that which is wisdom can also be called "knowledge," as the Apostle also speaks of it where he says: "Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I have been known" [*1 Corinthians* 8:1]; when he certainly means that knowledge is to be understood as the contemplation of God which will be the supreme reward of the saints; yet where he says: "To one indeed through the Spirit is given the utterance of wisdom; and to another the utterance of knowledge, according to the same Spirit" [cf. *1 Corinthians* 12:8], there is no doubt that he is clearly distinguishing between these two things, though he does not explain there what the difference is, and by what means both can be distinguished.

In examining the manifold riches of the Sacred Scriptures, I find it written in the book of Job, where that same holy man is speaking: "Behold, piety is wisdom, but to abstain from evil is knowledge" [cf. *Job* 28:28]. In this distinction it is to be understood that wisdom pertains to

[14] *sapientia*. [15] *scientia*.

contemplation, knowledge to action. For by "piety" in this passage he meant the worship of God, which in Greek is called *theosebia*. For this is the word used in this sentence in the Greek codices. And what is there in eternal things more excellent than God, who alone has an unchangeable nature? And what else is the worship of Him if not the love of Him, by which we now desire to see Him and believe that we shall one day see Him; and insofar as we make progress "we see now through a glass in a dark manner, but then" in the manifestation? For this is what the Apostle calls "face to face" [*1 Corinthians* 13:12], and this is what John also says: "Dearly beloved, now we are the children of God, and it has not yet appeared what we shall be. We know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like to him, for we shall see him just as he is" [cf. *1 John* 3:2]. The utterance[16] about these and other subjects of this kind seems to me to be the utterance itself of wisdom.

Yet to abstain from evil things, which Job called "knowledge," undoubtedly belongs to the category of temporal things. For it is in relation to time that we are subject to evil things, and we must abstain from them in order to come to those eternal goods. Wherefore, whatever we do prudently, courageously, temperately, and justly, and whatever knowledge we gather from history, either as furnishing us with examples to guard against or to imitate, and with the necessary proofs respecting any subject that is accommodated to our use, pertain to that science or discipline, wherewith our action is conversant in avoiding evil and in desiring good.

(23) Hence, when the utterance is about these things I hold it to be "the utterance of knowledge," to be distinguished from "the utterance of wisdom," to which belong those things which neither have been nor shall be, but which are; and on account of that eternity in which they are, it is said of them that they have been, are, and shall be without any changeableness of times. For they have not been in such a way that they have ceased to be, nor shall they be in such a way as if they were not now, but they always had and always will have the self-same being. But they abide not as bodies fixed in space and place, but as intelligible things in their incorporeal nature they are so present to the gaze of the mind, as those visible and tangible things are present in their places to the senses of the body.[17]

[16] *sermo.*

[17] This paragraph and the two that follow offer an eloquent account of Augustine's doctrine of illumination. See the Introduction.

Yet not only in regard to sensible things established in space do there abide intelligible and incorporeal reasons, apart from local space, but also in regard to the motions that pass by in periods of time, there stand also like reasons, apart from any transit in time, reasons themselves that are certainly intelligible and not sensible. Only a few succeed in arriving at these things with the eye of the mind, and when one does arrive insofar as it can, the one which arrives does not abide in them, but is repulsed by the rebounding, as it were, of the eye itself, and thus a transitory thought is formed of a thing that is not transitory.

And yet this transitory thought is committed to the memory by means of the sciences[18] in which the mind is instructed, so that there may be a place to which the thought that was forced to pass from there may again return; although if the thought should not return to the memory and find there what it had committed to it, then it would have to be brought to them as an uninstructed person, as it had already once been brought, and would find it where it had found it the first time, namely, in that incorporeal truth from which it would again be written down, as it were, and fixed in the memory. For a man's thought does not abide in the incorporeal and unchangeable reason of a square body, for example, as this incorporeal and unchangeable reason itself abides, if, in fact, it could attain to it without the phantasy of local space. Or if one were to grasp the rhythm of some artificial and musical sound, passing through intervals of time while it stands apart from time in a kind of secret and sublime silence, then it could at least be conceived as long as that singing could be heard. Yet what the gaze of the mind snatched from it, even though only in passing, and swallowing as it were into a belly, stored it in the memory, over this it will be able in a certain measure to ruminate again by recollection and transfer what it has thus learned into the respective branch of knowledge. But if it shall have been blotted out by absolute forgetfulness, then under the guidance of doctrine it will again come to that which had completely dropped away, and it will be found such as it was.

Chapter 15

(24) Therefore, that noble philosopher, Plato, endeavored to persuade [us] that the souls of men had lived here even before they had these bodies;

[18] *per disciplinas.*

and hence, it is that those things which are learned are rather remembered as known than known as new things. He relates how a certain boy, when asked I know not what about geometry, replied in such a way as if he were most proficient in this branch of learning. For when questioned step by step and skillfully, he saw what was to be seen and spoke of what he had seen.[19]

Yet if this were a recollecting of things previously known, then certainly everyone, or almost everyone, would be unable to do the same thing if questioned in this manner. For not all have been geometricians in their previous life, since there are so few of them in the human race that one can hardly be found. But we ought rather to believe that the nature of the intellectual mind is so formed as to see those things which, according to the disposition of the Creator, are subjoined to intelligible things in the natural order, in a sort of incorporeal light of its own kind, as the eye of the flesh sees the things that lie about it in this corporeal light, of which light it is made to be receptive and to which it is adapted.

For the corporeal eye, too, does not, therefore, distinguish white from black objects without a master, because it had already known these colors before it was created in this flesh. Finally, how can this be done only in regard to intelligible things, so that when anyone is properly questioned he is able to answer according to any branch of learning, even though he is ignorant of it? Why can nobody do this with sensible things, unless he has seen them in this present body, or believed the testimony of those who knew them and communicated them by letters or words? For we should not credit the story of those who say that Pythagoras of Samos recalled some such things that he had experienced when he had already been here in another body, and of others who relate that there were yet some others who experienced something of the kind in their minds.

That these were false recollections, such as those we commonly experience during sleep, when we seem to remember as though we have done or seen something which we have not done or seen at all, and that the minds of those even who are awake were affected in this way by the suggestion of the evil and deceptive spirits, whose care it is to deceive men by confirming or sowing this erroneous opinion about the revolutions of souls, can be conjectured from this, that if those things were truly recalled which they had seen when they had been previously placed here in other bodies, then

[19] We don't know whether Augustine actually read Plato's *Meno* (82a–86a), or whether he simply got this story from Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* 1.24.57.

the same thing would happen to many, nay to almost everyone. For they suppose that as the dead come from the living, so the living come from the dead, as sleepers from those who are awake, and those who are awake from those who sleep, and that this process goes on without cessation.

(25) If, then, this is the correct distinction between wisdom and knowledge, that to wisdom belongs the intellectual cognition of eternal things, but to knowledge the reasonable cognition of temporal things, it is not difficult to decide which is to be preferred to or placed after which. But if we must make use of another distinction for keeping these two things apart, it will doubtless be that which the Apostle teaches when he says: "To one indeed through the Spirit is given the utterance of wisdom, and to another the utterance of knowledge, according to the same Spirit"; nevertheless, the distinction which we have drawn between these two is also very clear, in that the one is the intellectual cognition of eternal things, the other is the rational cognition of temporal things, and no one doubts that the former is to be preferred to the latter.

As we, therefore, take leave of these things which pertain to the outer man, and desire to ascend within from those things which we have in common with the beasts before we come to the cognition of the intelligible and the highest things, which are eternal, the rational cognition of temporal things presents itself. Let us, therefore, also find a trinity in this if we can, just as we found it in the senses of the body, and in those things which entered into our soul or spirit in the way of images; so that instead of the corporeal things, placed outside of us, with which we came in contact through the bodily sense, we might now have the likenesses of bodies impressed within on the memory, from which thought might be formed, while the will as a third joined both together; just as in forming the sight of the eyes from without, the will applied it to the visible thing in order that vision might arise, joined both together, and itself also added itself thereto as a third.

But this subject shall not be compressed into this book in order that in the one that follows, if God shall give us His help, we may be able to investigate it properly, and then unfold whatever discoveries we have made.

Book 13

Outline

1. When we think of John, we represent him to ourselves with a made-up image of his outer features, and think of him as having a human soul, the nature of which we know from our own case. (1.1–3)
2. We turn over the sounds of words through images, but learn their meaning through reason. (1.4)
3. We can see faith in ourselves, but we have only indirect evidence that others have faith. (2.5)
4. How can it be that everyone wants to be happy, yet not everyone knows what happiness is? (4.7)
5. The answer is that happiness is getting everything you want and wanting only what it would be good for you to get. (5.8–7.10)
6. Since no one who is happy abandons life willingly, immortality is required for happiness. (8.11)
7. God has a plan for human salvation. (9.12–19.24)
8. By faith we may obtain the happiness of immortal life. (20.25)
9. One who commits the words of faith to memory, and whose will combines the words with their meaning, which he loves and believes, may live according to the trinity of the inner man. (20.26)

Chapter 1

In the preceding book of this work – the twelfth – we were busily occupied in distinguishing the function of the rational mind in temporal things, where not only our knowledge, but also our action are called into play,

from the more excellent function of this same mind which is employed in the contemplation of eternal things, and has its final goal in knowledge alone. But I think it more proper that I insert some passages from the Sacred Scriptures, whereby both can be kept apart more easily.

(2) John the Evangelist thus begins his Gospel: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God; and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him, and without him was made nothing that has been made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shines in the darkness; and the darkness grasped it not. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. This man came as a witness to bear witness concerning the light, that all might believe through him. He was not the light, but was to bear witness to the light. It was the true light that enlightens every man who comes into this world. He was in the world, and the world was made through him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But to as many as received him, he gave the power of becoming sons of God; to those who believe in his name. Who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. And we saw his glory – glory as of the only-begotten of the Father – full of grace and truth" [cf. *John* 1:1–14].

This whole passage I have cited from the Gospel has to do in its first part with that which is unchangeable and eternal, the contemplation of which makes us happy; but in that which follows, eternal things are mentioned in connection with temporal things. Consequently some things there pertain to knowledge, others to wisdom, as our distinction in the preceding twelfth book made clear. "For in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God; and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him, and without him was made nothing that has been made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shines in the darkness; and the darkness grasped it not" – [All these things] require a contemplative life, and are to be perceived by the intellectual mind. And the more progress anyone shall make in this matter, so much the wiser will he doubtless become.

Yet because of what he says: "The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness grasped it not," faith was surely necessary in order that we might believe what we did not see. For by "darkness" he meant the hearts of mortals that have been turned away from light of this kind and are less capable of beholding it. And, therefore, he proceeds to say: "There was a

man sent from God, whose name was John. This man came as a witness, to bear witness concerning the light, that all might believe through him." This has already been accomplished in time, and pertains to the knowledge which consists of historical cognition. But we think of John according to the phantasy which has been impressed on our memory by the idea[1] of human nature. And they think this in the same manner, whether they do not believe these words, or whether they do believe them. For both know what a man is, whose outer part, that is, the body, they have learned through the eyes of the body; but they possess the knowledge of his inner part, that is, the soul, in themselves, because they themselves are also men and live with men, so that they are able to think what is said: "There was a man whose name was John," because they also know names by speaking and hearing them. But they, who hold fast to what is also found there, "sent by God," hold fast to it by faith; and they, who do not hold fast to it by faith, either waver in doubt or deride it by their unbelief. Yet both (unless they are of the number of those exceedingly foolish ones who say in their heart: "There is no God" [*Psalm* 14:1; 53:1]), when they hear these words, think of two things: what God is, and what it means to be sent by God; and if they do not represent them in their mind as the things themselves really are, at least they do so insofar as they can.

(3) Furthermore, the faith itself which everyone sees to be in his heart if he believes, or does not see there if he does not believe – we know in a different way; not as bodies which we see with our bodily eyes, and, through their images which we retain in our memory, even think of them when they are absent; nor as those things which we have not seen, of which we somehow form thoughts from those things which we have seen and entrust to our memory, to which we may return when we will, in order that we may likewise see them there by recollection, or rather see their images, of whatever sort they may be that we have fixed there; nor as a living man whose soul indeed we do not see but infer from our own,[2] and from the corporeal motions gaze also in thought upon the living man, as we have acquired knowledge of him by sight. Faith is not so seen in the heart in which it is, by him whose it is; but we know most certainly that it is there, and our conscience proclaims its existence.

Although we are, therefore, commanded to believe for this very reason, that we cannot see that which we are commanded to believe; yet when

[1] *notitia*. [2] See DT 8.6.9 and the Introduction on Book 8.

the faith itself is in us, we see it in us, because the faith of things that are absent is present, and the faith of things that are without is within, and the faith of things that are not seen is seen; and yet it arises in time in the hearts of men, and if from believers they become unbelievers, it perishes from them. But sometimes our faith is accommodated even to false things. For in our ordinary manner of speaking we say: "I had faith in him and he deceived me." Such faith, if indeed it should even be called faith, vanishes from the heart without any guilt when the truth that has been discovered drives it away. But the faith in the things that are true passes over, as we would like it to do, into the things themselves. Thus we must not say: "It has vanished," when the things that were believed are seen. For is it indeed still to be called faith, since faith has been defined in the Epistle to the Hebrews and been called the evidence of things that are not seen? [cf. *Hebrews* 11:2]

(4) The words that then follow, "This man came as a witness, to bear witness concerning the light, that all might believe through him," are, as we have said, a temporal action. For he also bears witness in time concerning an eternal thing which is the intelligible light. To bear witness concerning this light, John came who "was not the light, but to bear witness concerning the light." For he adds: "It was the true light that enlightens every man who comes into this world. He was in the world, and the world was made through him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not." Those who know the Latin language understand all of these words from the things which they already know. Some of them have become known to us through the senses of the body, as man, as the world itself, the greatness of which we so clearly discern, or as the sounds of these same words, for hearing is also a sense of the body; but others have become known through the reason of the mind, such as that which was said: "and his own received him not," which are to be understood in this sense, that they did not believe in Him. And we do not arrive at this meaning of the words through any sense of the body, but through the reason of the mind.

We have also learned, not the sounds, but the meanings of the words themselves, partly through the sense of the body, partly through the reason of the mind. Nor did we now hear these words for the first time; we had already heard them, and we retained in our memory the knowledge not only of the words themselves, but also what they signified, and we recognized them here. For when this word of two syllables [*mundus*] is

uttered, since it is a sound, the corporeal thing certainly became known through the body, that is, through the ear; but what it signifies also became known through the body, that is, through the eyes of the flesh. For the world, insofar as it is known, is known to those who see. But this word of four syllables, *crediderunt*, being a sound and, therefore, a corporeal thing, reaches us through the ears of the flesh, but what it signifies is not known through any sense of the body, but through the reason of the mind. For unless we knew what *crediderunt* meant through our mind, we would not understand what they did not do, of whom it was said: "and his own received him not." The sound of the word, therefore, strikes the ears of the body from without and reaches the sense which is called "hearing."

The form, too, of the man is known to us in ourselves, and is likewise presented to the senses of the body from without in other men: to the eyes when it is seen; to the ears when it is heard; to the touch when it is held and touched; it also has its own image in our mind, incorporeal it is true, but yet similar to the body. Finally, the marvelous beauty of the world itself is present from without to our gaze, as well as to the sense which is called "touch," if we touch any part of it; it, too, has its image within our memory, to which we return when we think of it, though we are surrounded by walls or even in darkness. But as regards these images of corporeal things – incorporeal indeed but yet having the likeness of bodies, and belonging to the life of the outer man – we have already spoken at sufficient length in the eleventh book.

But we are treating now of the inner man and his knowledge, that knowledge, namely, which is concerned with temporal and changeable things; when in carrying out this function it assumes something even from things pertaining to the outer man, it must assume it for this purpose, that something may be learned from it that may help rational knowledge. And, therefore, the rational use of things, which we have in common with irrational animals, pertains to the inner man; nor can it be rightly said to be common to us and to irrational animals.

Chapter 2

(5) Yet according to the arrangement of our subject we are compelled to speak at greater length about faith in this book; those who possess it are called faithful, and those who do not possess it, infidels, such as those who did not receive the Son of God when He came unto His own. Although

faith is wrought in us by hearing, yet it does not pertain to that sense of the body which is called "hearing," since it is not a sound; nor to the eyes of the flesh, since it is not a color or form of the body; nor to that which is called "touch," since it has no flesh, nor to any sense of the body at all, since this is a thing of the heart, not of the body; nor is it outside of us, but in our inmost being; nor does any man see it in another, but each one sees it in himself; it can, finally, be feigned by pretense, and thought to be in him in whom it does not exist. Each one, therefore, sees his own faith in himself; he does not see, but believes it to be in another, and he believes all the more firmly, the more he sees its fruits which faith is wont to work through charity [cf. *Galatians* 5:6].

Wherefore this faith is common to all those of whom the Apostle then speaks: "But to as many as received him, he gave them the power of becoming sons of God; to those who believe in his name. Who were born not of blood nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God"; but this faith is not common as the form of a bodily object is common which may be seen by the eyes of all to whom it is presented, for in some way the gaze of all who behold it is informed by this one object itself; but as the human countenance is said to be common to all, for this is so said that yet each one certainly has his own.

We say most truly that the faith is indeed impressed from one doctrine on the hearts of the faithful who believe this same thing. But those things that are believed are one thing, and the faith by which they are believed is another thing. For the former are in the things of which it is said that they either are, or have been, or shall be, but the latter is in the mind of the believer, and is visible to him only of whom it is; although it is also in others, yet it is not the same, but similar. For it is not one in number, but in kind; and on account of its similarity and lack of diversity, we call it one rather than many. For even when we see two men very much alike we are surprised, and say that both have one countenance. It is, therefore, more easily said that the souls were many – a separate soul, of course, for each person – of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles that they had one soul [cf. *Acts* 4:32], than where the Apostle has said "one faith" [*Ephesians* 4:5], for anyone to venture to say that there are as many faiths as faithful.

And yet He who says: "O woman, great is thy faith" [*Matthew* 15:28] and to another: "O thou of little faith, why didst thou doubt?" [*Matthew* 14:31] signifies that each one has his own faith. But the same faith of those

believing is said to be one, just as the same will of those willing is said to be one, since even in those who will the same thing, his own will is visible to each one, but that of another is hidden, although he wills the same thing; and if this is manifested by some signs, it is believed rather than seen. But each one is conscious of his own mind, and certainly he does not believe, but clearly perceives that this is his own will.

Chapter 3

(6) The harmony of this same living and rational nature is indeed so great that although it is hidden from one what another wills, yet some wills of all are even known to each one, and although each man does not know what another man wills, yet in certain things he can know what all will. Hence, we have that humorous story of a certain actor who promised that in another play he would tell all in the theater what they had in their minds and what they willed; and when a very large crowd had assembled with great expectation on the day appointed, and when all were in suspense and silent, he is quoted as having said: "You wish to buy cheap and to sell dear."

Frivolous though this actor was, yet all discovered in his words what they were conscious of, and they applauded him with remarkable good will, for he had spoken the truth before the eyes of all, though it was not what they had expected. But why did he raise such great expectation by promising to speak about the will of all, unless because the wills of other men are hidden from us? But did not the actor know that will? Is there anyone who does not know it? And for what reason, pray, unless because there are certain things which each conjectures not unfitly to be in others from himself, through sympathy or agreement, in vice or virtue? But it is one thing to see one's own will, another to form a conjecture, even though it be well founded, about the will of someone else. For in human affairs I am just as certain that Rome was built as that Constantinople was, since I have seen Rome with my own eyes, but know nothing about the other place, except what I have believed on the testimony of others.

By looking into himself, or even from his own experience with others, that actor indeed believed that the desire to buy cheap and to sell dear was common to everyone. But since such a will is in fact a defect, everyone can acquire a sense of justice in matters of this kind, or can become subject to the disease of some other fault which is contrary to it, by which to resist and overcome it. For I myself know of the following case. A manuscript,

that was for sale, was offered to a man who realized that the seller was unaware of its value and, therefore, asked for only a trifling sum; yet this man gave a just price that was much greater, and which the seller did not expect. But suppose that wickedness has taken possession of anyone to such an extent that he sells cheap what his parents left him, and buys dear, in order to waste it on his passions. Such extravagance, in my opinion, is not at all incredible; and if such men are sought they can be found, or you may perhaps come across them without even looking for them; by a wickedness more than that of the theater, they mock the statement or declamation of the theater by buying their lusts at a great price, but selling their lands at a low price. We also know of certain ones who for the sake of distribution paid a higher price for corn, and sold it to their fellow-citizens at a lower price.

What the ancient poet, Ennius, also said, "All mortals desire themselves to be praised,"[3] he undoubtedly conjectured was in others, both from himself and from those whom he knew by experience, and thus seems to have expressed the desires of all men. If, finally, that actor had also said; "All of you wish to be praised, none of you wishes to be blamed," he would have seemed in a similar way to express what all men will. Yet there are some who hate their own faults, and do not wish to be praised by others for those things with which they themselves are dissatisfied, and express their gratitude to those who have the kindness to rebuke them, if the purpose of this rebuke is their amendment. But if that actor had said, "All of you wish to be happy;[4] you do not wish to be miserable," he would have said something that no one would have failed to acknowledge in his own will. For whatever else it is that anyone secretly wills, he does not withdraw from this will which is sufficiently known to all and is in all men.

Chapter 4

(7) But this is indeed wonderful, since the will to grasp and to retain happiness[5] is one in all: whence it comes about that there is, on the other

[3] *Annalium Reliquae (Incertae sedis Fragmenta).*

[4] Or blessed, *beati*. In this book *beatus* will almost always be translated "happy," rather than "blessed." Augustine here has under discussion what he thinks of as the truism that everyone wants to be *beatus*. Doubtless it is a truism that everyone wants to be happy, but, outside a religious context, it seems not to be a truism that everyone wants to be blessed. In Book 15 it will seem more natural to translate *beatus* as "blessed."

[5] *beatitudo*.

hand, such a great variety and diversity of wills about happiness itself, not that anyone does not will it, but that all do not know it. For if all knew it, it would not be considered by some to be in goodness of soul, by others in the pleasure of the body, by others in both, by some in this thing, and by others in that thing. For as anything particularly pleased them, so they placed in it their idea of the happy life.[6]

How, then, do all love so ardently what all do not know? For who can love what he does not know – a subject that I have already discussed in the preceding books?[7] Why is happiness, then, loved by all, and yet not known by all? Or do all perhaps know what it is, but all do not know where it is to be found, and hence arises the dispute? As if indeed there was a question about some place in this world where everyone ought to will to live who wills to live happily, and as if we were not seeking where happiness is when we are seeking what it is. For surely if it is in the pleasure of the body, he is happy who enjoys the pleasure of the body; if in goodness of soul, then he who enjoys this; if in both, then he who enjoys both.

When anyone, therefore, says: "To live happily is to enjoy the pleasure of the body," but another: "To live happily is to enjoy goodness of soul," is it that both are unaware of what the happy life is, or that both do not recognize it? How, then, do both love it, if no one can love that which he does not know? Or is it perhaps false, what we have laid down as most true and most certain, that all men will to live happily? If, for example, to live happily is to live according to goodness of soul, how does he will to live happily who does not will this? Should we not more truly say: "This man does not will to live happily, because he does not will to live according to goodness, which alone is to live happily"? Not all, therefore, will to live happily, nay few will it, if one cannot live happily, except by living according to goodness of soul, which many do not will.

Shall we consider that to be false, therefore, which not even that Academician Cicero doubted (for the Academicians doubt everything) who, when he wanted to begin his argument in the dialogue *Hortensius* with something about which no one would doubt, said: "All of us certainly will to be happy"? Far be it from us to say that this is false! What then? Are we to say that, although there is no other way of living happily than to live according to goodness of soul, nevertheless, even he who does not

[6] *beata vita*. This is the title of an early dialogue of Augustine's, written in late 386 and early 387.
[7] DT 8.4 and 10.1.

will this, wills to live happily? This indeed seems to be too absurd. For it is just as though we were to say: "He who does not will to live happily, wills to live happily." Who would listen to or defend such a contradiction? And yet necessity thrusts us into this position, if it is true that all will to live happily, and yet all do not will to live in that way in which alone they can live happily.

Chapter 5

(8) Or can we perhaps escape from this awkward situation by recalling what we have previously stated, that all place their idea of the happy life in the things that most please them? Thus Epicurus placed it in pleasure, Zeno in goodness, and some in other things, and so we may say that to live happily is nothing else than to live according to one's own pleasure, and, therefore, it is not false that all will to live happily, because all will that which pleases each. For if this had also been proclaimed to the people in the theater, all would find it in their own wills.

Yet even Cicero, when he had proposed this argument against his own, so refuted it as to make them blush who maintain it. For he declared: "But behold! Not the philosophers indeed, but those who are disposed to dispute, say that all are happy who live as they themselves will." We mean the same thing when we say "as pleases each." But he quickly added: "This is indeed false; for to will what is not becoming is itself most miserable; nor is it so miserable not to obtain what you will, than to will to obtain what you ought not." Most excellently expressed and certainly most true!

For whose mind is so blinded, and who is so estranged from every light of decency, and so involved in the darkness of shame, as to say that he who lives wickedly and shamefully, whom no one restrains, whom no one punishes, whom no one dares to rebuke, and who, moreover, is praised by very many, since as the Divine Scripture says: "The sinner is praised in the desires of his soul, and he who works iniquity is happy" [cf. *Psalm* 10:3], who satisfies all his most criminal and shameful wills is, therefore, happy, because he lives as he wills, when in reality, although even so he would be wretched, yet he would be less wretched if he could have had nothing of those things which he has wrongfully willed? For everyone is also made wretched by the bad will alone, but becomes more wretched by the power whereby the desire of the bad will is satisfied.

So, since it is true that all men will to be happy, and all will this one thing with the most impassioned love, and on account of it will other things, whatever they may be, and since no one can love that of which he is wholly ignorant, both as to what it is and of what kind it is, nor can he be ignorant of what it is that he knows that he wills, it follows that all know the happy life. But all who are happy have what they will, although not all who have what they will are at once happy; but they are at once miserable who either do not have what they will or who have what they do not rightly will. Therefore, he alone is happy who has all that he wills, and wills nothing wrongly.

Chapter 6

(9) Since the happy life, therefore, consists of these two things, and is known to all and dear to all, why is it that when men cannot have both of these two things, they prefer to have all that they will, rather than to will all things well, even if they cannot have them? Or is it the depravity itself of the human race that, although it is not hidden from men, he is not happy who does not have what he wills, nor he who has what he wills wrongly, but he who has whatever good things he wills and wills no bad things, yet when both of these two things, from which the happy life is realized, are not given, that is rather chosen, whereby he is further removed from the happy life (since he is further from it, who obtains what he wrongly desires than he who does not obtain what he desires); whereas the good will ought rather to be chosen and preferred, even though it does not obtain what it wills?

For he comes close to being a happy man who desires well whatever he desires; when he obtains what he desires, then he will be happy. And certainly not evil but good things make him happy, when they do so make him. He has already something of these good things, namely, that good will itself, and this should not be esteemed lightly; who desires to rejoice in the good of which human nature is capable, but not in the committing or acquiring of anything evil, and who pursues good things, such as they can be in this miserable life, with a prudent, temperate, brave, and just mind, and obtains them, insofar as this is given, so that he is good even among the wicked, and when all evil things have come to an end and all good things have been fulfilled, then he will be happy.

Chapter 7

(10) Therefore, in this mortal life so full of delusions and afflictions, faith, by which we believe in God, is particularly necessary. For there are no good things whatsoever, above all those by which one becomes good, and those by which one will become happy, of which any other source can be found when they come to man and are added to man, except it be from God. But when he, who is faithful and good amid these miseries, shall have come from this life to that happy life, then he will be truly able to do what is utterly impossible now, namely, that a man may live as he wills. For he will not desire to live wickedly in that felicity,[8] nor will he desire anything that will be wanting, nor will he be in want of anything that he shall desire. For whatever will be loved will be present, nor will that be desired which will not be present. Whatever will be there, will be good, and the supreme God will be the supreme good, and He will be present for the enjoyment of those who love Him; and the culmination of all this happiness will be the certainty that it will be so forever.

Now indeed there are philosophers who have made their own happy lives as it pleased each of them, just as though they could do by their own power what they were unable to do according to the common condition of mortals, that is, to live as they pleased. For they perceived that no one could be happy in any other way, except by having what he willed, and by suffering nothing that he did not will. But who would not will that the life, whatever it may be in which he delights, and which he, therefore, calls the happy life, should so be in his power that he could have it forever? And yet who is so? Who wills to endure hardships in order that he may endure them bravely, although he wills them, and can endure them when he suffers them? Who would wish to live in torments, even though he is able to live in them in a praiseworthy manner by preserving justice through patience? They who endured these evils, either in desiring to possess or in fearing to lose what they loved, whether wickedly or laudably, regarded them as transitory. For many have bravely directed their course through these transitory evils towards the good things that shall endure. They are certainly made happy by hope, even when they are in the midst of transitory evils, through which they arrive at the good things that shall not pass away.

He, however, who is happy in hope is not yet happy, for by patience he expects the happiness which he does not yet possess. He, on the contrary,

[8] Or happiness, *felicitas*.

who is tortured without any such hope, without any such reward, no matter how great a capacity for endurance he may manifest, is not truly happy, but is bravely miserable. He is not on that account not miserable, because he would be even more miserable if he were also to endure his misery with impatience. Furthermore, if he does not suffer things which he would not will to suffer in the body, yet even then he is not to be regarded as happy, since he does not live as he wills. For to omit other things which cause vexation to the mind, while the body remains unharmed – we would be willing to live without them, and they are innumerable – each one, if he could, would certainly will to have a body so sound and unharmed, and to suffer no inconveniences from it, that he would have it in his power, or in the incorruption of the body itself, and because he does not possess it, and remains in uncertainty about it, he assuredly does not live as he wills.

For although he may be ready by fortitude to receive and to bear with equanimity whatever adversity may befall him, he prefers that it shall not happen, and so arranges it if he can; and thus he is prepared for both, so that in as far as it lies in his power he desires the one and shuns the other, and if he should fall into that which he shuns, he, therefore, bears it willingly, because that which he willed could not be brought to pass. Hence, he bears with it that he may not be crushed, but he would not willingly be burdened.

How, then, does he live as he wills? Is it because he is willingly strong to bear that which he would not will to be imposed upon him? He wills, therefore, what he can, since he cannot have that which he wills. This is the sum and substance of the happiness of proud mortals – I know not whether we should laugh at or rather pity them – who glory in living as they will, because they willingly bear with patience what they do not will to happen to them. For they claim that this is what Terence has wisely said: "Since that cannot be which you will, will what you can."[9] Who can deny that this has been cleverly phrased? But it is a counsel given to a miserable man in order that he might not be more miserable. To a happy man, however, such as all will to be, it is not rightly or truly said "that cannot be which you will." For if he is happy, whatever he wills can be, because he does not will what cannot be. But the happy life is not the life of this mortal state, nor will it come to pass except when it will also be immortality. And if there were no way in which this could be given

[9] *Andria*, Act 2, scene 1, verses 5–6.

to man, then there would also be no purpose in seeking for happiness, because it cannot exist without immortality.

Chapter 8

(11) Since all men, therefore, will to be happy, certainly if they will truly, then they also will to be immortal, for otherwise they could not be happy. Furthermore, if they were questioned in a similar way about immortality as they also were about happiness, all answer that they will it. But happiness of whatever kind, such as is not so but rather is so called, is sought, nay indeed, it is feigned in this life, while immortality is despaired of, without which there can be no true happiness. For, as we have previously said and have proved sufficiently by our arguments, that man lives happily who lives as he wills and wills nothing wrongly. For no one wrongly wills immortality, if by the gift of God his human nature is capable of it; if it is not capable of this, then neither is it capable of happiness.

For that a man may live happily he must really live. If life itself abandons him at death, how can the happy life remain with him? But when it abandons him it doubtless abandons him unwillingly, willingly, or neither. If unwillingly, how can the life be happy which is so within his will that it is not within his power? And since no one is happy who wills something that he does not have, how much less is he happy who is abandoned against his will, not by honor, nor by possessions, nor by any other thing, but by the happy life itself, since he will have no life at all? Wherefore, even if no sense is left whereby his life may be miserable (for the happy life departs since the whole life departs), nevertheless, he is miserable as long as he feels, because he knows that against his will that is being destroyed on account of which he loves all other things, and which he loves before all other things. Life then cannot be happy and also abandon him against his will, because no one becomes happy against his will. And, therefore, how much the more does it make him miserable by abandoning him against his will, which would even make him miserable if it came to him against his will.

Yet if it abandons him willingly, even in this case how was that life happy which he who had it willed it to perish? It remains but to say that neither of these is in the mind of a happy man, that is, he is neither unwilling nor willing to be abandoned by the happy life, since life altogether abandons him through death, and he remains unshaken, with a heart that is tranquil

and ready for either alternative. But neither is that life happy which is such as to be unworthy of his love whom it makes happy. For how is that a happy life which the happy one does not love? Or how is it loved, if one accepts with indifference whether it grows strong or whether it perishes? Unless perhaps the virtues, which we so love on account of happiness alone, venture to persuade us that we do not love happiness itself. And if they do, then we certainly cease to love the virtues themselves when we do not love that on account of which alone we loved them.

Finally, how will that opinion be true, which has been so tried, so tested, so thoroughly sifted, and is so certain that all men will to be happy, if the very ones who are already happy, are neither unwilling nor willing to be happy? Or if they will it, as truth proclaims, as nature compels, in which indeed the supremely good and unchangeably happy Creator has implanted this will, if, I say, they who are happy will to be happy, then they certainly do not will not to be happy. But if they do not will not to be happy, they undoubtedly do not will that their happiness be destroyed and come to naught. But they can only be happy if they live and, therefore, do not wish that their life should perish. Consequently, whoever are either truly happy, or who desire to be so, will to be immortal. But he does not live happily, to whom what he wills is not present; there is no way, then, in which a life can be truly happy if it is not eternal.

Chapter 9

(12) Whether human nature can grasp this, which it yet regards as desirable, is no small question. But if faith is present, which is in those to whom Jesus has given the power of becoming sons of God, there is no question. With regard to those who have endeavored to discover these things from human reasons, scarcely a few have been able to arrive at the investigation of the immortality of the soul alone, and they were men endowed with great talent, had sufficient leisure, and were trained in the most subtle learning. And even for the soul they have not found a happy life that is stable, that is, a true life, for they have said that it returns to the miseries of this life even after its happiness.

Those among them who have been ashamed of this opinion, and who have thought that the purified soul was to be placed in eternal bliss without the body, hold such opinions about the past eternity of the world as to refute this opinion of theirs about the soul; it would take too long to prove

this here, but it has been sufficiently explained, insofar as I can judge, in the twelfth book of the *City of God*.[10]

This faith promises, however, not by human reasoning, but by divine authority, that the whole man, who certainly consists of soul and body, will be immortal and, therefore, truly happy. And consequently, when it was said in the Gospel that Jesus gave to those who "received him the power of becoming sons of God," and when the meaning of to receive Him had been briefly explained by saying "to those who believe in his name"; and when it was added in what manner they should become the sons of God "who were born not of blood, of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God," then lest this weakness, which we see and bear, should despair of such great excellence it was immediately added: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," in order that men might be convinced, by contrast, of that which seemed incredible.

For if the Son of God by nature became the Son of man out of compassion for the sons of men – this is the meaning of "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us" men [*John* 1:12–14] – how much more credible it is that the sons of man by nature become the sons of God by grace, and dwell in God in whom alone and from whom alone the blessed can be made sharers of His immortality; and that we might be convinced of this, the Son of God was made a sharer of our mortality?

Chapter 10

(13) To those, therefore, who say, "What, was there no other way for God to liberate men from the misery of this mortality, than that He should will the only-begotten Son, who is God and co-eternal with Himself, to become man by putting on a human soul and flesh, and so having been made mortal to suffer death?" it is not enough so to refute them as to assert that this way, whereby God deigned to liberate us through the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus was both good and befitting the divine dignity. We must also show that other possible means were not lacking on God's part, to whose power all things are equally subordinate, and yet that there was no other way more fitting, and no other needed for healing our misery.

For what was so necessary for raising our hopes and for liberating the minds of mortals, dejected by the condition of mortality itself, from the

[10] *City of God* 12.20.

despair of immortality, than to show how highly God esteemed us and how much He loved us? But what is more manifest and more glorious in this so great a proof of God's love, than that the Son of God, unchangeably good, while remaining in Himself what He was, and taking what He was not from us and for us without detriment to His own nature, and deigning to enter into fellowship without our nature, should first, without any evil desert of His own, bear our evils; and with undeserved munificence bestow His gifts upon us, who now believe how much God loves us, and now hope for that of which we had once despaired, without any good deserts of our own, nay with our own evil deserts going before us?

(14) For even those things that are called our merits are His gifts and in order that faith may work through charity [cf. *Galatians* 5:6], "the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us" [*Romans* 5:5]. But He was given at that time when Jesus was glorified by His Resurrection. For He then promised that He would send the Holy Spirit, and He sent Him [cf. *John* 7:39; 15:26; 20:22], because then, as it was written of Him, and previously prophesied: "He ascended on high, he led captivity captive, he gave gifts to men" [cf. *Ephesians* 4:8; *Psalm* 67:19]. These gifts are our merits, by which we arrive at the supreme good of immortal happiness. "But God commends his charity towards us," the Apostle says, "because when as yet we were sinners, Christ died for us. Much more now that we are justified by his blood, shall we be saved through him from the wrath." And he goes on to say: "For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, having been reconciled, shall we be saved by his life" [cf. *Romans* 5:8–10].

Those whom he first called sinners, he later called the enemies of God; those whom he first spoke of as justified by the blood of Jesus Christ, he afterwards spoke of as reconciled by the death of the Son of God; and those, he said, who were first saved from the wrath through Him, he afterwards said that they were saved by His life. Therefore, before this grace we were not sinners of any kind, but were in such sins as to be the enemies of God.

Yet the same Apostle referred to us previously in several places as sinners and enemies of God, but under two different names, the one seemingly very mild, the other obviously very harsh, saying: "For if when as yet we were weak, Christ died, according to the time, for the ungodly" [cf. *Romans* 5:6]. Those whom he called weak, he also called ungodly.

Weakness appears to be something light, but at times it is of such a kind that it may be called ungodliness. Yet except it were weakness, it would have no need of a physician, which in Hebrew is *Jesus*, in Greek, *Soter*, but in our language *Salvator.* The Latin language did not previously have this word, but it could have had it, just as it was able to have it when it wanted. But this preceding sentence of the Apostle, where he says: "when as yet we were weak, he died, according to the time, for the ungodly," harmonizes with these two following sentences; in one of them he calls us sinners, and in the other the enemies of God, just as though he had assigned to each what was proper to each, referring the sinners to the weak, but the enemies of God to the ungodly.

Chapter 11

(15) But what is the meaning of "justified by his blood?" What power, I ask, is there in this blood that believers are justified by it? And what is the meaning of "reconciled by the death of his Son?" Perhaps that when God the Father was angry with us, He saw the death of His Son for us, and was appeased with us? Or was His Son then appeased with us to such an extent that He even deigned to die for us, but that the Father was still angry with us to such an extent that, unless His Son died for us, He would not be appeased? What is it that the same Teacher of the Gentiles says in another place: "What then shall we say to these things? If God is for us, who is against us? He who has not spared his own Son, but has delivered him for us all; how has he not also, with him, given us all things?" [cf. *Romans* 8:31–32]

Unless the Father had already been appeased, would He have delivered His own Son, not sparing Him for us? Does not this opinion seem, as it were, to contradict that which we have just mentioned? For in that the Son dies for us, and the Father is reconciled with us by His death; but in this the Father, as it were, first loved us, and He does not spare His Son on account of us, and delivers Him to death for us. But I see that the Father also loved us previously, not only before His Son died for us, but before He founded the world, as the Apostle himself bears witness, who says: "As he chose us in him before the foundation of the world" [*Ephesians* 1:4]. Nor was the Son delivered for us, as it were, unwillingly, when the Father did not spare Him, because it was also said of him "Who loved me and gave himself up for me" [*Galatians* 2:20]. Therefore, the

Father, the Son, and the Spirit of both, work all things together, equally and harmoniously; yet we are justified by the blood of Christ, and we are reconciled to God by the death of His Son; and I shall also explain here how this was done, as far as I shall be able, and as much as shall seem sufficient.

Chapter 12

(16) By the justice of God the whole human race was delivered into the power of the devil, the sin of the first man passing originally into all of both sexes, who were born through conjugal union, and the debt of our first parents binding all their posterity. This delivering was first indicated in Genesis, where, when it was said to the serpent: "Earth shalt thou eat," it was said to the man: "Earth thou art, and into earth shalt thou return" [cf. *Genesis* 3:14, 19]. The death of the body was foretold by "into earth shalt thou return," because he would not have experienced it, if he had remained upright as he had been created. But what He says to the living man: "Earth thou art," shows that the whole man has been changed into something worse, for "earth thou art," is just the same as "My spirit shall not remain in those men, because they are flesh" [cf. *Genesis* 6:3]. Hence, God showed that He had then delivered man to the devil, to whom he had said: "Earth shalt thou eat." But the Apostle proclaims this more clearly where he says: "And you were dead in your offenses and sins, wherein once you walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, of this spirit which now works on the children of unbelief, in which even we, all of us, once led our lives in the desires of the flesh, doing the promptings of our flesh and of our affections, and were by nature children of wrath even as the rest" [cf. *Ephesians* 2:1–3].

The children of unbelief are the infidels, and who is not such before he becomes a believer? Wherefore, all men by their origin are under the prince of the power of the air "which works on the children of unbelief." I have said "by their origin"; this has the same meaning as the words of the Apostle "by nature," when he says that he had been by nature as the rest, that is, by the nature as it was corrupted by sin, not as it was created upright from the beginning.

Yet as regards the manner by which man was delivered into the power of the devil: it ought not to be understood as though God had done this or ordered this to be done, but only that He permitted it, yet justly. For

when He abandoned the sinner, the author of sin immediately entered into him. Nor has God indeed so abandoned His creature, as not to show Himself to him as the God who creates and vivifies, and in the midst of the evils that were inflicted for man's punishment, He bestows many good things even upon the wicked, for He has not shut up His mercies in His anger [cf. *Psalm* 76:10]. Nor has He allowed man to depart from the law of His power when He permitted him to be in the power of the devil, because not even the devil himself is withdrawn from the power of the Omnipotent One, just as he is not withdrawn from His goodness. Would even the wicked angels be able to subsist with whatever kind of life they have, except through Him who vivifies all things? If, therefore, the committing of sin, by the just anger of God, subjected man to the devil, then certainly the remission of sins, through the gracious reconciliation of God, has rescued man from the devil.

Chapter 13

(17) But the devil was to be overcome, not by the power of God, but by His justice. For what is more powerful than the Omnipotent One? Or what power of any creature can be compared with the power of the Creator? But when the devil became a lover of power through the vice of his own perversity, and the betrayer and attacker of justice, and since in this respect men also imitate him so much the more, in proportion as they set aside or even hate justice and strive after power, and as they either rejoice in acquiring power or are inflamed with the lust of it, it pleased God that for the sake of rescuing men from the power of the devil, the devil should be overcome not by power but by justice, and that men, too, by imitating Christ should seek to overcome the devil not by power but by justice.

Not that we should flee from power as though it were something evil, but order must be observed according to which justice comes first. For how great can the power of mortals be? Let mortals, therefore, hold fast to justice, power shall be given to the immortals. Howsoever great may be the power of those men who are called powerful on earth, it appears as a ridiculous weakness when compared with this power, and a pit is dug for the sinner where the wicked seem to be able to do very much. But the just man sings and says: "Blessed is the man whom thou shalt instruct, O Lord, and shalt teach him out of thy law. That thou mayest give him

rest from the evil days, till a pit be dug for the wicked. For the Lord will not cast off his people, and will not forsake his inheritance. Until justice be turned into judgment, and they that have it are all upright of heart" [cf. *Psalm* 93:12–15].

During this time, therefore, in which the power of the people of God is deferred, "the Lord will not cast off his people and will not forsake his inheritance," however great may be the afflictions and indignities that it must suffer in its lowliness and weakness "until justice," which the weakness of the godly now possesses, "is turned into judgment," that is, until those to be judged receive the power of judging, which is reserved to the just at the end, when the power shall follow the foregoing justice in its own order. For power added to justice, or justice according to power, constitutes the judiciary power. But justice belongs to a good will, and on this account it was said by the angels at the birth of Christ: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will" [*Luke* 2:14].

Power, however, ought to follow not precede justice; therefore, it is placed in "second," that is, in prosperous things; but they are called "second" from *sequendo.* For, as we have argued above, since two things make a man happy, to will well and to be able to do what he wills, there ought not to be that perversity to which we called attention in the same discussion, so that from the two things which make him happy, a man chooses to be able to do what he wills, and neglects to will what he ought, since he ought first to have a good will, but afterwards great power.

Moreover the good will must be cleansed of vices; but if a man is overcome by them, he is overcome in such a way that he wills evil, and in that case how will his will be still good? It is to be desired, therefore, that power be now given, but against vices; yet men do not want to be powerful in order that they may conquer their vices, while they want to be so in order to conquer their fellow-men. And what is the reason for this, if not that they who are truly conquered pretend to conquer, and so are victors, not in truth but in opinion? Let a man will to be prudent, brave, temperate, just, and that he may be able to have these things truly, let him certainly desire power and seek to be powerful in himself, and strange as it may seem, to be against himself for himself. But as regards the rest of the things which he rightly wills and yet cannot obtain, such as immortality, and true and complete bliss, let him not cease to desire them and patiently await them.

Chapter 14

(18) What is the justice, therefore, by which the devil was conquered? What, unless the justice of Jesus Christ? And how was he conquered? Because, although he found in Him nothing worthy of death, yet he slew Him. And it is certainly just that the debtors, whom he held, should be set free, since they believed in Him whom he slew without any debt. It is in this way, then, that we are said to be justified by his blood [*Romans* 5:9]. For so that innocent blood was shed for the remission of our sins. Therefore, it is said in the Psalm that he is free among the dead [cf. *Psalm* 87:6]. For only he that is dead is free from the debt of death. Hence, it is also said in another Psalm: "Then did I pay that which I took not away" [cf. *Psalm* 68:5]. By the thing which He took away is meant sin, because sin is taking hold against what is lawful. And hence, He also says through the mouth of His flesh, as it is read in the Gospel: "Behold, the prince of this world is coming, and in me he has not found anything," that is, no sin, "but that all may know," He said, "that I do the will of my Father, arise, let us go from here" [cf. *John* 14:30–31]. And He went from that place to His passion, in order that He might pay for us, the debtors, that which He Himself did not owe.

Would the devil have been conquered by this most just right, if Christ had willed to contend with him by power and not by justice? But He held back what He could, in order that He might first do what was fitting, and for this reason it was necessary for Him to be both man and God. For unless He were man, He could not be slain; unless He were God, men would not believe that He did not will what He could, but would believe that He could not do what He willed; nor would we think that He preferred justice to power, but that He lacked the power. Now, on the contrary, He suffered human things for us because He was man; but if He had been unwilling, He could not have suffered these things because He was also God. His justice, therefore, was made more pleasing by His humiliation, because the power in His divinity was so great that He could not suffer if He had not willed this humiliation. And thus by the death of One so powerful, justice was commended and power promised to us helpless mortals. He did the first of these two things by dying, and the second by rising from the dead.

For what is more just than to come for the sake of justice even to the death of the cross? And what is more powerful than to rise from the dead,

and to ascend into heaven with the same flesh in which He was slain? And, therefore, He conquered the devil first by justice and afterwards by power, namely, by justice because He had no sin and was most unjustly slain by him; but by power because the dead One has lived again, never afterwards to die [*Romans* 6:9]. But He would have conquered the devil by power, even if He could not have been slain by him, although it is a sign of greater power to overcome even death itself by rising again, than to avoid it by living.

It is, however, for another reason that we are justified by the blood of Christ when we are rescued from the power of the devil through the remission of sins; it pertains to this, that the devil is conquered by Christ by justice, not by power. For Christ was crucified through the weakness which He took upon Himself in our mortal flesh, not through His immortal power; yet of this weakness the Apostle says: "The weakness of God is stronger than men" [*1 Corinthians* 1:25].

Chapter 15

(19) It is not difficult, therefore, to see how the devil was conquered when He, who was slain by him, rose again. But that is something greater and more profound of comprehension, to see how the devil was conquered when he seemed to have conquered, that is, when Christ was slain. For then that blood, since it was the blood of Him who had no sin at all, was shed for the remission of our sins, that because the devil deservedly held those whom he had bound by the condition of death as guilty of sin, he might deservedly loose them through Him who was guilty of no sin, and whom he had undeservedly struck with the punishment of death. The strong man was conquered by this justice and bound by this chain, that his vessels might be taken away [cf. *Mark* 3:27], which with himself and his angels had been vessels of wrath while with Him they might be turned into vessels of mercy [cf. *Romans* 9:22–23].

For the Apostle Paul describes how these words of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself were spoken to him from heaven when he was first called. For among the other things that he heard, he also declares that the voice spoke as follows: "For I have appeared to thee for this purpose, to appoint thee to be a minister and witness of those things which thou seest from me, of those things wherein I shall appear to thee, delivering thee from the people and from the nations, to whom I am now sending thee, to

open the eyes of the blind that they may turn away from darkness and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and the lot which is among the saints, and the faith which is in me" [cf. *Acts* 26:16–18]. Wherefore, when the same Apostle also exhorts the believers to give thanks to God the Father he says: "Who has rescued us from the power of darkness, and transferred us into the kingdom of the Son of his love, in whom we have redemption for the remission of sins" [*Colossians* 1:13–14].

In this redemption the blood of Christ was as it were the price given for us (but the devil upon receiving it was not enriched but bound), in order that we might be loosed from his chains, and that he might not involve in the nets of sin and so draw with himself to the ruin of the second and eternal death [cf. *Apocrypha* 21:8], anyone of those whom Christ, free from all debt, had redeemed by pouring out His own blood without being obliged to do so; but that they belonging to the grace of Christ, foreknown, predestined, and chosen before the foundation of the world [*1 Peter* 1:20], should die only insofar as Christ Himself died for *us*, by the death of the flesh only, not of the spirit.

Chapter 16

(20) For although the death itself of the flesh came originally from the sin of the first man, yet its good use has produced the most glorious martyrs. And, therefore, not only death itself, but all the evils of this world, especially the sorrows and labors of men, even though they come from the deserts of sin, and above all of original sin, by which even life itself has become bound by the chain of death, yet they ought to remain even after the sins have been forgiven, in order that men might have wherewith to struggle for the truth, and from which the virtue of the faithful might be exercised, in order that the new man, even amid the evils of this world, might be prepared through the new testament for the new world, by wisely enduring the misery which this condemned life has deserved, and by prudently rejoicing because it will be ended, yet awaiting faithfully and patiently for the happiness, which the future life, when it has been set free, shall have without end.

For the devil has been cast out of his dominion and out of the hearts of the faithful, and although he himself was also condemned in their condemnation and unbelief, yet he reigned. He is permitted, in accordance

with the condition of this mortality, to offer only so much opposition as God knows to be expedient for them; and the Sacred Scriptures proclaim this through the mouth of the Apostle: "God is faithful, who will not permit you to be tempted above that which you are able; but will make also with temptation issue, that you may be able to bear it" [cf. *1 Corinthians* 10:13]. But these evils, which the faithful piously endure, are helpful either to correct sins, or to exercise and test justice, or to show the misery of this life, in order that they may desire more ardently and seek more earnestly after that life, where there will be true and perpetual happiness.

But with regard to this let those things be observed which the Apostle says: "We know that for those who love God all things work together unto good, for those who, according to his purpose, are called to be saints. For those whom he has foreknown, he has also predestined to become conformed to the image of his Son, that he should be the firstborn among many brethren. But those whom he has predestined, them he has also called; and those whom he has called, them he has also justified; and those whom he has justified, them he has also glorified." None of these predestined shall perish with the devil; none will remain until death under the power of the devil. Then follow the words which I have already mentioned above: "What then shall we say to these things? If God is for us, who is against us? He who has not spared his own Son, but has delivered him for us all; how has he not also, with him, given us all things?" [cf. *Romans* 8:28, 32]

(21) Why, then, should not the death of Christ take place? Nay rather, why should not the innumerable other ways which the Almighty could make use of to liberate us be passed over, and this one chosen before all as the means to bring it about? For by it nothing is lessened or changed from His divinity, and so great a benefit is conferred upon men from the human nature which He took upon Himself, that a temporal death which was not due was rendered by the eternal Son of God, who is at the same time the Son of man, whereby He might free them from the eternal death that was due. The devil was holding fast to our sins, and by means of them was deservedly fixing us in death. He, who had no sins and was undeservedly led by him to death, released them. So great a price did that blood have that he who slew Christ for a time by the death that was not due should no longer detain anyone who has put on Christ in the eternal death that was due.

Therefore, "God commends his charity towards us, because when as yet we were sinners, Christ died for us. Much more now that we are justified by his blood, shall we be saved through him from the wrath." "Justified," he said, "by his blood." Justified obviously in that we have been freed from all sins; but freed from all sins since the Son of God, who had no sins, was slain for us. "We shall be saved through him from the wrath," certainly from the wrath of God which is nothing else than just vengeance. The wrath of God is not a disturbance of the mind as it is in man, but is the wrath of Him, to whom Scripture says in another place: "But thou, O Lord of power, judgest with tranquillity" [cf. *Wisdom* 12:18]. If, then, the just vengeance of God has received such a name, how else can the reconciliation with God be rightly understood, unless that then such wrath is ended? Nor were we enemies of God except as our sins are enemies of justice, and when these are forgiven such enmities are at an end, and they are reconciled to the Just One, whom He Himself justifies.

Those, however, who were also His enemies, He certainly loved seeing that "he has not spared his own Son, but has delivered him for us all," when as yet we were sinners. Therefore, the Apostle rightly goes on to say: "If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son," by which that forgiveness of sins was wrought, "much more having been reconciled, shall we be saved by his life." We are saved by His life, who were reconciled by His death. For who can doubt that He will give His life for His friends, for whom He gave His death when they were His enemies? "And not only," he said, "but we exult also in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received reconciliation." "Not only," he said, shall we be saved, "but we exult also," not in ourselves, but "in God," nor through ourselves, but "through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received reconciliation," according to those things that we have discussed above.

Then the Apostle continues: "Therefore as through one man sin entered into this world, and through sin death, and so death has passed unto all men, in whom all have sinned" [cf. *Romans* 5:8–12], and the rest of the things in which he speaks at great length about the two men: the one and first Adam, through whose sin and death we, his descendants, are bound as it were by hereditary evils; but the other, the second Adam, who is not a man only but also God, and when He had paid for us what He did not owe, we were freed from the debts of our parents and our own. Therefore, since the devil on account of that one held all who were born

by his vitiated carnal concupiscence, it is just that on account of this One, He should free all who were born again spiritually by His immaculate grace.

Chapter 17

(22) Though the Incarnation of Christ is displeasing to the proud, yet there are also many other things in it which will prove profitable for us to examine and to study. One of them is that it has been shown to man what place he would occupy in the things that God has established, seeing that human nature could be so united with God as to become one person from two substances, and, therefore, He is now made up of three: God, the soul, and the flesh. And so these proud and evil spirits, who interpose themselves as mediators to deceive us, though under the pretext of helping us, do not, therefore, dare to prefer themselves to man because they have no flesh, and above all, because the Son of God also deigned to die in the same flesh lest they might persuade people to worship them as gods since they seemed to be immortal.

Next, in order that the grace of God might be commended to us in the man Christ without any preceding merits of our own, because even He Himself did not obtain by any preceding merits that He should be joined in such great unity to the true God as to become the Son of God, one person with Him; but from that time when He began to be man, from that time He was also God. Wherefore it was said: "The Word was made flesh."

Then there is also this reason: that the pride of man, which more than anything else hinders him from cleaving to God, might be refuted and cured by such great humility on the part of God. For man also learns how far he has departed from God and what efficacy there is in pain to cure him when he returns through such a Mediator, who, as God, helps men by His divinity, and as man adapts Himself to them by His weakness.

And then what greater example of obedience could be offered to us, who had perished by disobedience, than that of the Son of God, who became obedient to God the Father even to the death of the cross? [cf. *Philemon* 2:8] Where, in fact, could the reward of obedience itself be better shown than in the flesh of so great a Mediator which rose again to eternal life? It also belonged to the justice and the goodness of the Creator that the devil should be overcome by the same rational creature which he prided himself in having overcome, and indeed by one coming from the race

itself, the whole of which he held captive by the corruption of its origin through one.

Chapter 18

(23) For God was certainly able to assume human nature elsewhere than from the race of Adam, who by his sin bound the human race, in which He might be the Mediator between God and men, just as He did not create the first man whom He created from the race of anyone else. He could, therefore, create another man in this manner or in any manner that He pleased, by whom the conqueror of the first man would be conquered. But God judged it better, both to assume human nature from the race itself that was conquered, through which He would conquer the enemy of the human race, and yet to take it from a virgin, whose conception, the spirit, not the flesh, the faith, not passion, preceded [cf. *Luke* 1:26–28].

Nor did the concupiscence of the flesh intervene, by which all others are propagated and conceived who contract original sin; since concupiscence was wholly absent, the holy virginity was fecundated by believing, not by lying together, so that what was born from the stock of the first man drew its origin only from the race, not from the sin also. For a nature was born that was not corrupted by the contagion of transgression, but was the only remedy for all such vices. For a man was born, I say, having no sin and not to have any sin at all, through whom those who were to be liberated from sin and who could not be born without sin would be born again.

For although conjugal chastity can make a good use of the carnal concupiscence which is in the genital members, yet it has involuntary movements, which prove either that it could not exist at all in paradise before sin, or if it did exist, that it was not then such as that it should sometimes resist the will. But now we feel it to be such that it fights against the law of the mind and arouses the desires of intercourse, even if there is no question of begetting; if it yields, then it is satisfied by sinning; if it does not yield, then it is restrained by withholding its consent; who can doubt that these two things were alien from paradise before sin? For neither did that honesty do anything indecent, nor did that felicity tolerate anything unquiet. It must needs be, therefore, that no carnal concupiscence should be at all present there when the offspring of the Virgin was conceived, in whom the author of death would find nothing worthy of death, and yet would slay Him, only to be conquered by the author of life.

The conqueror of the first Adam, and the master of the human race, was conquered by the second Adam and lost the Christian race that was liberated out of the human race from human guilt through Him who was not in the guilt, although He was from the race, in order that that deceiver might be conquered by that race which he had conquered by its guilt. And this was so done, not that man might be exalted, but that "he who boasts, let him boast in the Lord" [*2 Corinthians* 10:17].

For he who was conquered was only a man, and, therefore, he was conquered because in his pride he desired to be God; but He who conquered was both man and God, and, therefore, He so conquered, being born of a virgin, because God in humility did not govern that man as He governed the other saints, but bore Him as a Son. But such great gifts of God, and whatever else there are – it would take too long to investigate them now, and to discuss their relationship with this subject – could not exist unless the Word were made flesh.

Chapter 19

(24) But all these things which the Word made flesh did and suffered for us in time and place belong, according to the distinction which we have undertaken to point out, to knowledge, and not to wisdom. But because the Word is without time and without place, He is co-eternal with the Father and is wholly present everywhere. And if anyone is able, insofar as he is able, to bring forward a truthful utterance about this, then that utterance will belong to wisdom; and, therefore, the Word made flesh, which is Christ Jesus, possesses the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. For when writing to the Colossians the Apostle says: "For I wish you to know what great conflict I have for you and for them that are at Laodicea, and whosoever have not seen my face in the flesh; that their hearts may be comforted, being joined together in charity and in all the riches of the fullness of understanding, so as to know the mystery of God, which is Christ Jesus, in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" [cf. *Colossians* 2:1–3].

How far the Apostle had known these treasures, how much of them he had penetrated, at how great things he had arrived in them, who can know? But as for me, according to that which is written: "But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to everyone for profit; to one indeed by the Spirit is given the utterance of wisdom; and to another the utterance of knowledge,

according to the same Spirit" [*1 Corinthians* 12:7–8]. If these two so differ between themselves that wisdom has been attributed to divine things and knowledge to human things, I recognize both in Christ, and everyone who believes in Him agrees with me. And when I read: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," I recognize the true Son of God in the Word, and the true Son of man in the flesh, and both are united together into the one person of God and man by the ineffable liberality of grace. Wherefore he proceeds to say: "And we saw his glory – glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father – full of grace and truth." If we refer grace to knowledge and truth to wisdom, I think that we shall not be averse to that distinction between these things that we have commended.

For in things that have their origin in time, that is the supreme grace, that man is united with God in the unity of person; but in eternal things the supreme truth is rightly attributed to the Word of God. But that the same one is Himself the Only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, this was done that He Himself might also be in the things done for us in time; the same one for whom we are cleansed by the same faith, in order that we may contemplate Him steadfastly in eternal things.

Those distinguished philosophers of the Gentiles, however, who were able to perceive that the invisible things of God are understood by those things that are made, yet held back the truth in wickedness, as it was said of them, because they philosophized without the Mediator, that is, without the man Christ, and did not believe that He would come to the Prophets or that He had come to the Apostles. For placed as they were in these lowest things, they could not but seek for some means whereby they might reach those sublime things which they had understood; and so they fell into the power of these deceitful demons, who brought it about that they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into a likeness of the image of corruptible man, of birds, of four-footed beasts, and of serpents [cf. *Romans* 1:20, 18, 23]. For in such forms they even set up or worshiped idols.

Christ, therefore, is our knowledge, and the same Christ is also our wisdom. He Himself plants the faith concerning temporal things within us; He Himself manifests the truth concerning eternal things. Through Him we travel to Him; through science we proceed to wisdom; but we do not depart from the one and the same Christ, "in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." But we are now speaking of knowledge; later on we shall speak of wisdom, insofar as He shall grant. Nor

do we so understand these two terms, as if it were not allowed to speak, either of that wisdom which is in temporal things, or of that knowledge which is in divine things. For according to a wider usage of speech, both can be called wisdom, both can be called knowledge. Nevertheless, the Apostle would in no wise have written: "To one is given the utterance of wisdom, to another the utterance of knowledge," unless each of these was also properly called by its own special name, and it is this distinction between them that we are now discussing.

Chapter 20

(25) Hence, let us now see what this lengthy discussion has achieved, what conclusions it has gathered, and at what point it has arrived. It is characteristic of all men to will to be happy, but yet the faith, by which the heart is purified and arrives at happiness, is not characteristic of all. And thus it comes about that one must strive through faith, which all do not will, for the happiness which no one cannot but will. That they will to be happy, all see in their own hearts; so great in fact is the agreement of human nature in this matter that a man is not deceived who conjectures from his own mind that this is also true of another's mind; finally, we know that all will this.

Many despair, however, of the possibility of being immortal, although that which all will, namely, to be happy, cannot be realized in any other way; but they also will to be immortal if they could; but by not believing that they can, they do not so live that they can. Faith is, therefore, necessary in order that we may obtain happiness in all the good things of human nature, that is, of the soul and the body. But the same faith maintains that this faith be limited in Christ, who rose from the dead in the flesh never more to die; that no one can be freed from the dominion of the devil through the remission of sins save through Him, and that in the parts of the devil, life must indeed be miserable and yet unending, and should be called death rather than life.

I have also discussed it in this book, inasmuch as I could, within the allotted space of time, but in the fourth book of this work I also had a number of things to say about this same subject.[11] But there I did so for one reason, here for another reason, that is, there I wanted to show why and

[11] DT 4.19.25–20.29.

how Christ was sent by the Father in the fullness of time [cf. *Galatians* 4:4], because of those who say that He who sent, and He who was sent, cannot be equal in nature, but here my intention was to distinguish the active science from contemplative wisdom.

(26) I wished, therefore, to ascend as it were by steps, and to seek in the inner man a trinity of its own kind, both in knowledge and wisdom, as we previously sought it in the outer man, in order that we might come with a mind more developed by exercise in these lower things to the contemplation of that Trinity which is God, according to our own modest capacity, if we can do even this, at least in an obscure manner and through a mirror [*1 Corinthians* 13:12].

If anyone, therefore, has committed to memory the words of this faith according to the sounds alone without knowing what they mean, as they are wont to retain Greek words in their memory who do not know Greek, or similarly Latin words, or those of any other language of which they are ignorant, does he not have a kind of trinity in his mind, since those sounds of the words are also in the memory even when he does not think of them; and the vision of his recollection is formed from them when he thinks of them; and the will of him who remembers and thinks joins both together? Yet we should by no means say that such a one, when he acts in this manner, acts according to the trinity of the inner man, but rather according to that of the outer man because he remembers, and, when he wills, contemplates as much as he wills, that alone which belongs to the sense of the body which is called hearing; and when such a thought is in his mind he is concerned with nothing else than the images of corporeal things, that is, of sounds. If, however, he retains and recalls what these words signify, then he is already doing something that is indeed characteristic of the inner man, but even so, we must not yet say or think that he lives according to the trinity of the inner man if he does not love those things which are proclaimed, commanded, and promised there.

For he can also retain and think of them, so that supposing them to be false, even endeavors to refute them. Hence, the will, which there combines those things retained in the memory, and those impressed from it on the gaze of thought, completes indeed a trinity of some kind, since itself is added as a third; but the man does not live according to this when he does not accept those things of which he has thought, since he regards them as false. But when he believes them to be true and loves those things there which are to be loved, then he already lives according to the trinity

of the inner man, for everyone lives according to that which he loves. But how are those things loved which are not known but only believed? We have already discussed this question in the preceding books,[12] and found that no one loves that of which he is completely ignorant; but when unknown things are said to be loved, they are loved from those things which are known.

We shall now bring this book to a close with the admonition that the just man lives by faith [cf. *Romans* 1:17]. This faith works through charity in such a way that the virtues also, whereby one lives prudently, bravely, temperately, and justly, are all referred to the same faith, for in no other way can they be true virtues. Nevertheless, they do not possess such great power in this life that the forgiveness of sins of one kind or another is not sometimes necessary here; and this is only done through Him who conquered the prince of sinners by His own blood. Whatever ideas are in the mind of a believing man from this faith and from such a life when they are contained in the memory, examined in the recollection, and accepted by the will, form a trinity of its own kind. But the image of God about which, with His help, we shall afterwards speak is not yet in it; this will then become more apparent when I shall point out where it is. The reader may look for this in the following book.

[12] DT 8.8 and 10.1.

Book 14

Outline

1. "Wisdom" may be taken to designate the Second Person of the Trinity, or both knowledge of the temporal and the eternal, or simply knowledge of the eternal. (1.1–3)
2. The memory, sight, and love of our faith is already an image of God. (2.4)
3. We can distinguish various lesser human trinities. (3.5–4.6)
4. We may question whether the mind of an infant is present to itself as an adult mind is. (5.7)
5. Let us return to the trinity of memory, understanding, and will, as discussed in Book 10. (6.8)
6. We know things we are not, at the time, thinking of. (7.9)
7. The mind's memory, understanding, and love of itself constitute an image of God. (8.11)
8. The three virtues, prudence, courage, and temperance, united in justice, constitute a trinity. (9.12)
9. Memory, understanding, and foresight, constitute a trinity. (10.13–11.14)
10. Remembering, understanding, and loving God constitute an image of God. (12.15–14.20)
11. God is eternal and present everywhere as a whole. (15.21)
12. We are exhorted to a life of faith. (16.22–19.26)

Chapter 1

We are now to treat of Wisdom, not that of God which is undoubtedly God – for His only-begotten *Son* is called the Wisdom of God [cf. *Ecclesiasticus* 24:5; *1 Corinthians* 1:24] but we shall speak about the

wisdom of man, yet of *true* wisdom which is according to God, and is the true and principal worship of Him; in Greek it is called by one word *theosébia*. Since our writers also wished to interpret this word by a single term, as we have already mentioned, they called it "piety," *pietas*, while among the Greeks the more usual name for piety was *eusébia*; but because *theosébia* cannot be perfectly translated by one word, it is better to use two words, so that it should rather be called the worship of God [*Dei cultus*].

That this is the wisdom of man, which we have already explained in the twelfth book of the present work,[1] is proved by the authority of Sacred Scripture in the book of Job, the servant of God, where we read that the Wisdom of God said to the man: "Behold, piety is wisdom, but to abstain from evil, knowledge" [cf. *Job* 28:28]. But some have also translated this Greek word *epistêmê*, as *disciplina*, which has certainly taken its name from *discendo*, and for this reason can also be called "knowledge." For everything is learned in order that it may be known.

"Discipline," however, is commonly spoken of in another sense, namely, in reference to those evils which anyone suffers for his sins in order that he may be corrected. Such is its meaning in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "For what son is there to whom his father does not give discipline?" And he says even more clearly in the same Epistle: "For all discipline seems for the present to be a matter not for joy but for grief; but afterwards it will yield the most peaceful fruit of justice to those who have been exercised by it" [cf. *Hebrews* 12:7, 11].

God Himself, therefore, is the highest wisdom, but the worship of God is the wisdom of man about which we are now speaking. For "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God" [*1 Corinthians* 3:19]. In accordance with this wisdom which is the worship of God, the Sacred Scripture says: "The multitude of the wise is the welfare of the whole world" [*Wisdom* 6:26].

(2) But if it is for wise men to discuss wisdom, what shall we do? Shall we venture to profess wisdom so that our discussion of it may not appear impudent? Or shall we be deterred by the example of Pythagoras who, since he did not venture to profess wisdom, answered that he was rather a philosopher, that is, a lover of wisdom? Thus arose this name which so pleased succeeding generations that from then on, no matter how greatly

[1] DT 12.14.

anyone might seem either to himself or to others, to excel in subjects pertaining to wisdom, yet he should only be called a philosopher.

Or is it that none of these men, then, ventured to acknowledge himself as wise, because they considered a wise man to be without any fault? But our Scripture does not say that, which says: “Rebuke a wise man, and he will love thee” [*Proverbs* 9:8]. For it certainly judges that he has a sin, since it declares that he should be rebuked. But even so, I do not venture to call myself a wise man; it is sufficient for me, what even they themselves cannot deny, that it is also the function of the philosopher, that is, of the lover of wisdom, to treat of wisdom. They have not refrained from doing this who professed themselves to be the lovers of wisdom rather than wise men.

(3) But when arguing about wisdom they defined it by saying: “Wisdom is the knowledge of human and divine things.” Wherefore, in the preceding book, I, too, did not omit to say that the knowledge of divine and human things should be called “wisdom” as well as “knowledge.”[2] But according to this distinction in which the Apostle said: “To one is given the utterance of wisdom, to another the utterance of knowledge” [*1 Corinthians* 12:8] it is necessary to divide this definition in such a way that the knowledge of divine things is properly called “wisdom,” but the name “knowledge” properly belongs to the knowledge of human things. When I discussed this question in the thirteenth book, I certainly did not attribute to knowledge whatever can be known by man in human things, where needless vanity and harmful curiosity are excessively abundant, but only that whereby the most wholesome faith, which leads to true happiness, is begotten, nourished, protected, and strengthened. Very many of the faithful are not exceedingly strong in this knowledge, although they are exceedingly strong in the faith itself.

It is one thing merely to know what a man must believe in order to gain a happy life, which is nothing other than eternal life, but another thing to know how this may help the godly, and be defended against the godless, which the Apostle seems to call by the proper name of “knowledge.” When treating this subject previously I took care to commend faith itself in a particular manner. I prefaced it by a brief explanation of the distinction between eternal and temporal things, and spoke there about temporal things; but while I deferred the discussion about eternal things to this

[2] DT 13.1.19.

book, I likewise pointed out that a temporal faith about eternal things dwells indeed temporally in the hearts of the faithful, but is nonetheless necessary on account of the eternal things themselves that are to be obtained.[3]

I also explained that faith in the temporal things that the Eternal One carried out and suffered for us in the man whom He bore in time and led to eternal things is also useful in acquiring those eternal things, and that the virtues themselves, whereby one lives prudently, bravely, temperately, and justly in this temporal mortality, are not true virtues unless they are referred to the same faith which, though temporal, leads, nevertheless, to eternal things.[4]

Chapter 2

(4) Wherefore, since it is written: "As long as we are in the body, we are absent from the Lord; for we walk by faith, not by sight" [cf. *2 Corinthians* 5:6–7], then certainly as long as the just man lives by faith [cf. *Romans* 1:17], even though he lives according to the inner man, even though he advances through this same temporal faith towards the truth and strains forward to eternal things, nevertheless, the retention, contemplation, and love of this same temporal faith is not such a trinity as to be now called the image of God, lest that should seem to be placed in temporal things which ought to be placed in eternal things. For the human mind, when it sees its own faith by which it believes that which it does not see, does not see anything everlasting.

This will not always be so; it certainly will not be so when this pilgrimage during which we are absent from the Lord has come to an end. So we must walk by faith, and that sight will take its place by which we shall see face to face [*1 Corinthians* 13:12], just as now, although we do not see, yet because we believe, we shall deserve to see and shall rejoice that we have been brought to sight through faith. Faith will no longer be that by which those things that are not seen are believed, but rather the sight by which those things are seen which were believed. Hence, even if we then remember this mortal life that has passed away, and recall in the memory that we once believed that which we did not see, this faith will be reckoned among things that are past and completed, not among things

[3] DT 13.7. [4] DT 13.20.

that are present and abide eternally. Therefore this trinity also, which now consists in the memory, sight, and love[5] of this same faith that is present and abides, will then be found to have been dealt with and past, and not as still enduring. From this we gather that even if this trinity is already an image of God, yet it, too, should not be reckoned among those things which always are, but among the things that pass away.

Since the nature of the soul is immortal, nor from the time when it was first created has it ever thereafter ceased to be, far be it from us to think that the best thing it has does not endure with its own immortality! But what better thing has been created in its nature than that which has been made according to the image of its Creator? [cf. *Genesis* 1:27] It is, therefore, not in the retention, contemplation, and love of the faith which will not always be, but in that which will always be, that the image is to be found which ought to be called the "image of God."

Chapter 3

(5) Or shall we still examine a little more diligently and abstrusely whether this is how the matter stands? For it can be said that this trinity does not perish when the faith itself is past. For, just as we now retain it in our memory, perceive it in our thought, and love it with our will, so too then, when we shall retain it in our memory and recall that we once had it, and shall join both of these together by the will as a third, the same trinity will remain. For if in its passing the faith has not left, as it were, some trace of itself within us, then certainly we shall have nothing of it in our memory to which we can turn when recalling it as past, and combining both of these together by the attention [i.e., of the will] as a third, namely, that which was in the memory even when we were not thinking of it, and that which was formed from it when we were thinking of it.

Yet he who says this does not recognize the difference between the trinity that we have now, when we retain, see, and love the faith that is present within us, and that which shall then be, when we shall behold by recollection not the faith itself, but, as it were, an imaginary trace of it hidden in the memory, and shall join these two together by the will as a third, that is, what was in the memory of him who retains, and what is impressed from it upon the gaze of him who remembers. In order that we

[5] This trinity of memory, sight, and love, should be compared with the trinity of memory, understanding, and love, which emerges at DT 12.11.18.

may be able to grasp this, let us take an example from corporeal things of which we have spoken sufficiently in the eleventh book.[6]

For as we ascend from the lower to the higher things,[7] or enter from the outer to the inner things, we find the first trinity in the body which is seen, in the gaze of the one who sees, which is informed by the body when it sees, and in the attention of the will which combines both. We can assume a trinity similar to this when, as that body in place, so the faith which is in us has been so established in our memory that the thought of the one remembering is formed from it, just as the eye of the beholder from that body, and to both of these, in order that the trinity may be completed, the will is reckoned as a third, which connects and combines the faith established in the memory and a kind of effigy of it impressed on the gaze of recollection; just as in that trinity of the corporeal vision, the attention of the will joined the form of the body that is seen, and the corresponding form that arises from it in the gaze of the beholder.

Let us, therefore, suppose that that body, which was seen, has disappeared and perished, and nothing of it has remained in any place to which the gaze might turn in order to see it: now because the image of this body that has expired and passed away remains in the memory, and because the gaze of thought is formed from it, and both are joined together by the will as a third, are we, therefore, to say that it is the same trinity as that former one, when the species of the body posited in place was seen? Certainly not! It is altogether different for, aside from the fact that the former was from without and the latter was from within, the former was certainly produced from the form of the body that was present, and the latter by the image of the body that has passed.

So it is, too, in the subject we are now discussing, and because of which we thought it good to adduce this example: the faith which is now in our mind, just like that body in a place, while it is retained, seen, and loved, does produce a kind of trinity; but this trinity will no longer exist when this faith in the mind, like that body in a place, no longer exists. But the trinity which then exists when we shall remember that it was in us and is there no longer, will certainly be different. For the thing itself that is

6 DT 11.2.

7 The idea of an ascent to the divine is a common Augustinian theme. See M. Nussbaum, "Augustine and Dante on the Ascent of Love," in *The Augustinian Tradition*, ed. Gareth B. Matthews, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999, 61–90.

present and fastened to the mind of the believer produces this trinity that now is; but the imagination of the thing that has passed and been left in the memory of the one who remembers will produce that trinity which will then be.

Chapter 4

(6) Therefore, neither will the latter trinity, which does not now exist, be the image of God, nor is the former trinity the image of God, which then will not be: but that image of the Creator that has been implanted immortally in its own immortality must be found in the human soul, that is, in the rational or intellectual soul. For just as the immortality of the soul itself is said to be according to a certain mode – for the soul too has its proper death when it is without the happy life, which is to be called the true life of the soul, but is called immortal for this reason, that it never ceases to live some kind of a life, even when it is most wretched – so even though reason or intelligence is now dormant in it, or now appears to be small and now great, yet the human soul is never anything but reasonable and intellectual. Therefore, if it were made according to the image of God in respect to this, namely, that it is able to use its reason and intelligence to understand and to behold God, then certainly from the first moment that so great and so marvelous a nature began to be – whether this image be so effaced as almost to amount to nothing, or whether it be obscured and disfigured, or whether it be clear and beautiful – it always exists.

Pitying the disfigurement of its dignity the Divine Scripture then says: "Although man walks in an image, yet he is disquieted in vain; he stores up, and he knows not for whom he shall gather those things" [cf. *Psalm* 39:7]. It would not, therefore, attribute vanity to the image of God, unless it saw that it was disfigured. But it sufficiently shows that this disfigurement is not so great as to take away its being an image by saying: "Although man walks in an image." Hence, this sentence can be expressed with equal truth in two ways; thus just as it was said: "Although man walks in an image, yet he is disquieted in vain," so it may also be said: "Although man is disquieted in vain, yet he walks in an image." For although it is a great nature, yet it could be corrupted because it is not the highest, and although it could be corrupted because it is not the highest, yet because it is capable of the highest nature and can be a sharer in it, it is a great nature.

Let us, therefore, seek in this image of God a trinity of its own kind, with the help of Him who has made us to His own image. For in no other way can we investigate these things for our salvation, and, in accordance with the wisdom that is from Him, find something. But if those things which we said in the preceding books, and especially in the tenth, about the soul or the mind are either retained and recalled in the reader's memory, or are read again carefully in the same places in which they were written, then he will not desire a more prolonged discussion here about our investigation of so great a subject.

Chapter 5

(7) We said, therefore, among other things in the tenth book, that the mind of man knows itself.[8] For the mind knows nothing so well as that which is present to itself, and nothing is more present to the mind than it is to itself. And we made use of other arguments, insofar as seemed sufficient, which proved this with absolute certainty.

What are we to say, then, about the mind of an infant that is still so small and plunged in so great an ignorance of things that the mind of a man that knows something shudders at the darkness of the infant's mind? Are we also to believe that it knows itself, but is too intent on those things through which it begins to experience pleasure through the senses of the body, a pleasure that is so much the greater the more unfamiliar it is? That it cannot be ignorant of itself, yet it cannot think of itself? Furthermore, we can infer how strongly it is attracted towards those sensible things that are from without from this one fact alone, the greediness with which it looks at a light; thus if someone incautiously or unaware of what might happen places a light at night where an infant is lying down, and at such an angle that from its prostrate position it can turn its eyes to it without being able to turn its neck, the gaze of that infant is not withdrawn from it. Thus we know of some who have even become squint-eyed as a result, since their eyes, while still tender and soft, retained that form which habit had in some way impressed upon them.

So too with the other senses of the body: the souls of children so confine themselves, as it were, by their concentration upon them, insofar as that age permits any concentration at all, that they either intensely

[8] DT 10.7.10.

abhor or else desire nothing else except that which harms or entices them through the flesh. They have no thought of their inner self, nor can they be admonished to do so; for they do not yet know the signs of an admonition, among which words occupy the principal place, for of these as well as of other things they are absolutely ignorant. But we have already shown in this same book that it is one thing not to know oneself, and another thing not to think of oneself.[9]

(8) But let us pass over this age, which cannot be questioned about what goes on within it, and which we ourselves have forgotten to a great extent. Suffice it for us to be only certain that if a man is capable of thinking about the nature of his own mind, and of discovering what is true about it, he will not find it anywhere else than with him himself. But he will not find what he did not know, but that of which he was not thinking. For what do we know, if we do not know what is in our mind, since all that we know, we cannot know except with our mind?[10]

Chapter 6

But so great is the power of thought that not even the mind itself may place itself, so to speak, in its own sight, except when it thinks of itself. And consequently nothing is so in the sight of the mind, except when one thinks of it, that not even the mind itself, by which is thought whatever is thought, can be in its own sight in any other way than by thinking of itself. But how it is not in its own sight when it does not think of itself, since it can never be without itself – as though itself were one thing and its sight another thing – I am unable to discover. For it is not absurd to speak thus of the eye of the body, since the eye itself is fixed in its own proper place in the body, but its sight is directed to those things that are without, and reaches even to the stars. Nor is the eye in its own sight, seeing that it does not see itself, except when a mirror is placed before it, as we have already said.[11] Certainly this does not happen when the mind places itself in its own sight by thinking of itself.

Or does the mind, then, by one part of itself see another part of itself when it sees itself by thinking, as with some of our members, the eyes, we

[9] DT 10.5.7.
[10] This is a rather elliptical argument for the mind's "privileged access" to its own contents.
[11] DT 9.3.3.

see our other members which can be in our sight? What can be said or thought that is more absurd than this? For by what, therefore, is the mind removed except by itself and where is it placed in its own sight except before itself? Hence, it will not be there where it was when it was not in its own sight, because it is put down in one place after it is withdrawn from another place. But if it has wandered away in order to be seen, where will it remain in order to see? Or is it, as it were, doubled, so that it is both there and here, that is, both where it can see and where it can be seen: in itself in order that it may see, and before itself in order that it may be seen? When the truth is consulted, it does not give any of these answers, since when we think thus, we think only through the feigned images of bodies, and that the mind is not such is absolutely certain to the few minds that can be consulted for the truth about this matter.

It remains, therefore, that its sight is something belonging to its nature, and the mind is recalled to it when it thinks of itself, not as it were by a movement in space, but by an incorporeal conversion; on the other hand, when it does not think of itself, it is indeed not in its own sight, nor is its gaze formed from it; but yet it knows itself, as if it were a remembrance of itself to itself. It is like a man versed in many sciences: what he knows is contained in his memory, nor is anything from there present in the sight of his mind, except when he thinks of it. But all the rest is hidden in a kind of secret knowledge which is called memory.

The trinity, then, which we were presenting, was constituted in this way, that we placed that from which the gaze of thought was formed in the memory; next the conformation itself, which is as it were the image impressed by it; and finally, that by which both are joined together, namely, love or the will. When the mind, therefore, sees itself through thought, it understands itself and recognizes itself; consequently, it begets this, its own understanding and its own knowledge. For an incorporeal thing is understood when it is seen, and is known when it is understood. Yet the mind does not indeed so beget its own knowledge, when it beholds itself as understood by thought, as though it had been previously unknown to itself. But it was known to itself as things are known which are contained in the memory, even though they are not thought, since we say that a man knows letters, even when he is thinking of other things and not of the letters. But these two, the begetter and the begotten, are bound together by love as a third, and this is nothing else than the will seeking for or holding

on to the enjoyment of something. And, therefore, we thought that a trinity was also insinuated by these three names, memory, understanding, and will.

Chapter 7

(9) But since towards the end of the same tenth book, we said that the mind always remembers itself, always understands itself, and always loves itself, although it does not always think itself to be distinct from those things that are not itself, we must now ask in what way understanding belongs to thought, but the knowledge of anything which is in the mind, even when one does not think of it, is said to belong to the memory alone. For if this is so, then the mind did not have these three things, so that it remembered itself, understood itself, and loved itself; but it only remembered itself, and afterwards when it began to think of itself, then it understood itself and loved itself.

Let us, therefore, consider more carefully that example which we have used, whereby it was shown that it is one thing not to know something, but another thing not to think of it; and that it is possible for a man to know something of which he is not thinking, namely, when he is thinking of something else and not of this thing. Thus when a man skilled in two or more branches of learning is only thinking of one, still he knows the other one or the other ones, even if he is not thinking of them. But can we rightly say: "This musician indeed knows music, but does not understand it now, because he is not thinking of it; on the other hand, he understands geometry now, because he is thinking of it now?" Such an opinion, to all appearance, is absurd. Furthermore, what if we should also say: "This musician indeed knows music, but he does not love it now, when he is not thinking of it, but he loves geometry now, since he is thinking of it now" – is not this likewise absurd? But we say most rightly: "This man, whom you behold in a discussion about geometry, is also an accomplished musician, for he remembers this art, understands it, and loves it; but although he knows it and loves it, he is not thinking about it now, since he is thinking about geometry which he is now discussing."

We learn from this that in the hidden recesses of the mind there is a certain knowledge of certain things, and that when we think of them, they then proceed, as it were, to the center and are placed, so to speak, more clearly in the sight of the mind, for then the mind itself discovers that

it remembers, understands, and loves those things of which it was not even thinking when it was thinking of something else. But with regard to something of which we have not thought for a long time, and of which we are unable to think except when it is brought to our attention, I do not know in what marvelous way, if I may so express it, we do not know that we know.

Finally, one who reminds another may rightly say to the one whom he reminds: "You know this, but you do not know that you know it; but I shall remind you, and you shall find that you know what you thought you did not know." Books also serve the same purpose, since they are written about things that the reader, under the guidance of reason, has found to be true; not those which he believes to be true on the testimony of him who wrote them, as when history is read, but those which he himself has also found to be true either in himself, or in the truth itself, the light of the mind. On the other hand, he, who, in the great blindness of his heart, cannot even recall these things when reminded of them, is plunged more deeply in the darkness of ignorance, and needs a more extraordinary help from God in order that he may be able to attain true wisdom.

(10) For this reason, therefore, I wished to employ some kind of a proof with respect to thought, by which it could be shown how the gaze of the mind is formed in remembering from those things which are contained in the memory, and that some such thing is begotten when a man thinks, such as was in him when he remembered before he thought, because those things are kept apart more easily that follow one another in time, and where the parent precedes its offspring in the space of time.

For if we take ourselves to the inner memory of the mind by which it remembers itself, and to the inner understanding by which it understands itself, and to the inner will by which it loves itself, where these three things are always together at the same time, and always have been together at the same time, from the moment when they began to be, whether one thought of them or whether one did not think of them, then the image of that trinity, too, will indeed be seen to belong to the memory alone; but because the word cannot be there without the thought (for we think everything that we say, even if we speak by that interior word belonging to no nation's tongue). This image is rather to be recognized in these three things, namely, memory, understanding, and will. But I am now referring to understanding as that whereby we understand when actually thinking, that is, when our thought is formed after the finding of those things which

had been present in our memory, but of which we were not thinking, and I am referring to will, love, or dilection as that which unites this child with its parent, and is in some way common to both.

Hence, it was that I also led the readers of slower understanding by means of external and sensible things that are seen through the eyes of the flesh, namely, in the eleventh book; and from thence I entered with them into that power of the inner man by which he reasons about temporal things, while I deferred the discussion about that dominating, principal power by which he contemplates eternal things; and this I did in two books. In the twelfth I distinguished between the two powers, one of which is the higher and the other is the lower which must be subject to the higher; but in the thirteenth I discussed, with what truth and brevity I could, the function of the lower power, in which is contained the saving knowledge of all human things, so that we may do in this temporal life that by which we may obtain eternal life; thus I have included within the narrow limits of one book a subject so complex and so copious, and that has become celebrated by so many great treatises of many great writers, discovering also a trinity in it, but not yet that which is to be called the image of God.

Chapter 8

(11) We have now finally arrived at that point in our discussion where we begin to consider the principal part of the human mind, by which it knows or can know God, in order that we may find therein an image of God. For although the human mind is not of the same nature as God is, yet the image of His nature, which is better than any other nature, ought to be sought for and found there in us, where there is also the best thing that our nature has.

Yet we must first consider the mind in itself before it is a partaker of God, and before His image is to be found in it. For we have said that, even though it has become impaired and disfigured by the loss of its participation in God, it remains nonetheless an image of God.[12] For it is His image by the very fact that it is capable of Him, and can be a partaker of Him; and it cannot be so great a good except that it is His image.

Behold! the mind, therefore, remembers itself, understands itself, and loves itself; if we perceive this, we perceive a trinity, not yet God indeed,

[12] DT 14.4.6.

but now finally an image of God. The memory has not received from without what it was to retain, nor has the understanding found without what it was to behold, as does the eye of the body, nor has the will joined these two from without, as it joins the form of the body, and that which was wrought from it in the eye of the beholder; nor when the thought was turned to it, has it found an image of the object seen from without which has been seized, so to say, and hidden in the memory, and from which the gaze of the one recollecting has been formed, while the will as a third joins both together, as we showed taking place in those trinities which were found in corporeal things, or which were somehow drawn within from bodily objects through the senses of the body – all of these things we have discussed in the eleventh book.[13]

Nor, again, was it as that which took place, or appeared to do so, when we went on to discuss that knowledge that is completed in the workings of the inner man, and which is to be distinguished from wisdom; what is learned from knowledge[14] is, as it were, adventitious to the mind, and was either brought in to it in historical knowledge, as are deeds and words which are performed in time and pass away, or are established in the nature of things in their own places and regions, or whether they arise in the man himself, since they were not there previously, either through the teaching of others or through his own reflections, such as the faith which we commended at length in the thirteenth book; or as the virtues by which, if they are genuine, we, therefore, live well in this mortality, in order that we may live blessedly in that immortality that is divinely promised.

These and other things of the kind have their own proper order in time, wherein the trinity of memory, vision, and love appeared more easily to us. For some of them precede the knowledge of the learners, since they are knowable even before they are known, and beget the knowledge of themselves in those who are learning. There are things, however, which are either in their own proper places, or have passed in time; although those that have passed no longer exist themselves, but only certain signs of them as passed, and these signs, when they are either seen or heard, indicate what was and what has passed. Such signs are either located in certain places, as the tombs of the dead and the like; or they are in reliable books, as is all history of weight and approved authority; or they are in the minds

[13] DT 11.2.2. [14] *scientia*, as opposed to *sapientia*, wisdom.

of those who already know them, since what is already known to them is certainly knowable to others also, and though the signs existed before their knowledge of them, yet they can know them through the teaching of those to whom they are already known.

All of these things, when they are learned, form a kind of trinity, by their own form, which was knowable even before it was known, and by the application to this of the knowledge of the learner, which then begins to be when it is learned, and by the will as a third which combines both. And when they are known, then in recalling them, another trinity arises within in the mind itself from those things which are impressed on the memory when they are learned, and from the informing of the thought when the gaze has been turned to them in the process of remembering, and from the will which as a third combines both.

But those things which arise in the mind where they have not been, such as faith and other things of the kind, even though they appear to be adventitious since they are implanted by instruction, yet they are not situated without or completed without, as are those things which are believed, but they began to be wholly within in the mind itself. For faith is not that which is believed, but that by which it is believed; and the former is believed, the latter is seen. Yet because it began to be in the mind, which already was a mind even before these things began to be in it, it appears to be something adventitious, and it will be reckoned among things which have passed, because when sight shall take its place, it will have already ceased to be; now it forms one trinity by its presence when it is retained, seen, and loved; but then it will form another trinity by some trace of itself which it has left behind when passing through the memory, as has already been said above.

Chapter 9

(12) Whether the virtues, too, by which one lives well in this mortality – they also begin to be in the mind which, although it was previously without them, was a mind nonetheless – will then cease to be when they have led to eternal things is no simple question. For it seemed to some as if they would cease to be, and, as a matter of fact, if we speak only of three of them, prudence, courage, and temperance, there seems to be something to be said in favor of this opinion; justice, on the contrary, is immortal, and it will then be more perfected in us rather than cease to be.

But Tullius,[15] the great master of eloquence, who discusses all four of these in the dialogue *Hortensius*, says: "If after passing from this life we were permitted to spend an immortal eternity on the islands of the blessed, as the fables relate, what need would there be for eloquence since there would be no trials, or even of the virtues themselves? For we would have no need of courage, since no labor or danger would confront us; nor of justice, since there would be nothing belonging to another that would be desired; nor of temperance, which controls the passions, since there would no longer be such; nor in fact would we have any need of prudence, since we would no longer be faced with the choice between good and evil. We should be blessed merely by learning and knowing nature, and for this reason alone is the life of the gods also to be praised. From this we can conclude that all other things serve some need, but that this alone [blessedness] is the free choice of the will."

Thus, when he praised philosophy, that great orator, [Cicero,] recalling what he had received from the philosophers and explaining it in a clear and persuasive manner, declared that only in this life, which we see filled with tribulations and delusions, are all four virtues necessary; that there will be none of them, however, when we have departed from this life, provided only that we are permitted to live there where we can live blessedly; but that good minds are blessed merely by learning and knowing, that is, by contemplating the nature, than which there is none better and more amiable: it is the nature that has created and arranged all other natures. If justice demands submission to its rule, then justice is altogether immortal, and will not cease to be in that blessedness, but it will be of such a kind and so great that it cannot be more perfect and greater.

Perhaps the other three virtues will also be in that happiness: prudence without any danger then of going astray, courage without the vexation of evils that have to be endured, temperance without the struggle against evil passions; so that it may be the function of prudence not to prefer or to make any good equal to God, of courage to cleave to Him most tenaciously, and of temperance not to find delight in any harmful defect. But what justice now does in relieving the miserable, prudence in warding off snares, courage in bearing misfortunes, temperance in restraining perverted pleasures, will not be there, where there will be no evil of any kind.

[15] Cicero.

And so these works of the virtues, which are necessary for this mortal life, like the faith to which they must be referred, will be reckoned among the things that have passed; and they form one trinity now, when we hold on to them as present, contemplate them, and love them; they will form another trinity then, when we shall find that they no longer are, but have been, by means of some traces of their passing which they have left in the memory, because even then there will be a trinity when that trace, of whatever sort it may be, will be retained in the memory, will be truly known, and both of these will be joined together by the will as a third.

Chapter 10

(13) In the knowledge of all these temporal things which we have mentioned, certain knowable things precede knowledge by an interval of time; such are those sensible things which already were in things before they were known, or all those things which are known through history; but some begin to be at the same time as the knowing of them; as for instance, if something visible, which up to then had no being at all, arises before the eyes, certainly this does not precede our knowledge; or again if some sound is made where a hearer is present, then both the sound and its hearing certainly begin to be at the same time and cease to be at the same time. But knowable things, whether they precede in time or begin to be at the same time, beget knowledge and are not begotten by knowledge.

Yet when knowledge is begotten, and that which we have known is placed in the memory and is again seen by recollection, who does not see that the retention in the memory is prior in time to the sight in recollection, as well as to the combining of both of these by the will as a third? But again it is not so with the mind. For it is not adventitious to itself, as if to the mind already existing, there were to come from somewhere else that same self not already existing; or as if it did not come from somewhere else, but in the mind itself already existing, there was born the mind itself not already existing, just as there arises in the mind which already existed, the faith which did not exist; or as if the mind sees itself, as it were, set up in its own memory, after it has learned to know itself by recollection; just as if it were not there before it knew itself, since from the moment that it began to be, it has certainly never ceased to remember itself, never ceased to understand itself, and never ceased to love itself, as we have already shown. And, therefore, when it is turned to itself by thought, then arises

a trinity, in which a word, too, can at last be identified, for it is formed from thought itself, and the will which unites both. Here, then, we may recognize more clearly than before the image which we are seeking.

Chapter 11

(14) Someone will say that this is not memory whereby the mind, which is always present to itself, is said to remember itself, since memory is concerned with the past and not with the present. For when some discussed the virtues – Tullius is also among them – they divided prudence into these three parts, memory, understanding, and foresight; that is, they attributed memory to past things, understanding to present things, and foresight to future things; but they do not have certainty in foresight, unless they foresee future things, and men do not have this gift, unless it is given to them from above as to the prophets. Wherefore the book of Wisdom says of men: "For the thoughts of mortal men are fearful, and our foresight uncertain" [cf. *Wisdom* 9:14]. But the memory of past things, and the understanding of present things is certain: certain, of course, with regard to incorporeal things that are present, for bodily things are present to the gaze of the bodily eyes.

Whoever says that memory is not concerned with present things, let him take note how this is expressed in secular literature itself, where greater attention is paid to correctness of diction than to the truth of things: "Nor did Ulysses suffer such things, nor did the Ithacan forget himself in so great a danger" [*Aeneid* 3.628–9]. Now when Vergil says that Ulysses did not forget himself, what else did he mean except that he remembered himself? Since, then, he was present to himself, he would not have remembered himself at all, unless memory pertained to present things. Wherefore, as in past things, that is called memory which makes it possible for them to be recalled and remembered, so in a present thing, which the mind is to itself, that is not unreasonably to be called memory, by which the mind is present to itself, so that it can be understood by its own thought, and both can be joined together by the love of itself.

Chapter 12

(15) Hence, this trinity of the mind is not on that account the image of God because the mind remembers itself, understands itself, and loves

itself, but because it can also remember, understand, and love Him by whom it was made. And when it does so, it becomes wise; but if it does not, even though it remembers itself, knows itself, and loves itself, it is foolish. Let it, then, remember its God, to whose image it has been made, and understand Him and love Him.

Or to express this more briefly, let it worship the God who was not made, but by whom it was made so that it is capable of Him and can be a partaker of Him; wherefore it is written: "Behold, the worship of God is wisdom" [cf. *Job* 28:28]; and not by its own light, but by a participation in that highest light, will it be wise, and where the eternal light is, there it will reign in blessedness. This wisdom is so called the wisdom of man, as to be also that of God. For it is then true wisdom, since if it is only human wisdom, it is vain. But it is not so with the wisdom of God, whereby God is wise, for God is not wise by partaking of His own wisdom, as the mind is by the partaking of God.

But just as the justice of God is also called not only that justice by which He Himself is just, but also that which He gives to man when He justifies the impious – the Apostle commends this latter justice when he says of certain ones: "For ignorant of the justice of God and seeking to establish their own, they have not submitted to the justice of God" [*Romans* 10:3] – so too it can be said of certain ones: "Ignorant of the wisdom of God and seeking to establish their own, they have not submitted to the wisdom of God."

(16) Therefore, the nature that has not been made, and that has made all natures both great and small, is undoubtedly more excellent than those which it has made, and, therefore, than this, too, of which we are speaking, namely, the rational and intellectual nature which is the mind of man, and which has been made according to the image of Him who made it. But the nature more excellent than all the others is God. And indeed "He is not far from anyone of us," as the Apostle says, and then adds: "In him we live and move and have our being" [*Acts* 17:27–28]. If this were said with regard to the body, it could also be understood of this corporeal world, for we also live and move and have our being in Him according to the body. Therefore, it must be understood in a more excellent and, at the same time, invisible and intelligible way, namely, with respect to the mind that has been made to His image.

What is not in Him of whom it is divinely written: "For from him and through him and unto him are all things"? [*Romans* 11:36] If, then, all

things are in Him, in whom, pray, can those things live that live, and those things be moved that are moved, except in Him in whom they are? Yet not all are with Him in that way in which it was said to Him: "I will always be with you" [*Psalm* 73:23]. Nor is He Himself with all things in that way in which we say: "The Lord be with you." The great wretchedness of man, therefore, is not to be with Him without whom he cannot be. For undoubtedly he is not without Him in whom he is, and yet if he does not remember Him, and does not understand Him, nor love Him, he is not with Him. But what anyone completely forgets, then it is impossible even to remind him of it.

Chapter 13

(17) Let us take an example from visible things to clarify this subject. Someone whom you do not recognize says to you: "You know me," and to aid your memory he mentions where, when, and how he made your acquaintance. If, however, in spite of all the signs that he has used to awaken your recollection, you still do not recognize him, then you have already forgotten him to such an extent that all that knowledge has been completely erased from your mind; and there remains nothing else but to believe him who tells you that you once knew him, or not even that, if the speaker seems to you to be unworthy of belief. But if you remember him, then you certainly return to your memory, and you find in it that which has not been completely blotted out by forgetfulness.

Now let us return to that because of which we employed this example from human life. Among other things the ninth Psalm says: "Let the wicked be turned to hell, all the nations that forget God" [cf. *Psalm* 9:17]. But later on the twenty-first Psalm declares: "All the ends of the earth shall be reminded, and shall be turned to the Lord" [cf. *Psalm* 22:27]. These nations, then, had not so forgotten God that they did not remember Him when reminded of Him. But by forgetting God and, as it were, forgetting their proper life, they had been turned to death, that is, to hell. But when reminded they are turned to the Lord, as though coming back to life, by remembering the proper life which they had forgotten. It is likewise said in the ninety-fourth Psalm: "Understand now, ye senseless among the people, and ye fools, be wise at last. He who planted the ear, shall he not hear?" [cf. *Psalm* 94:8–9] For this was said to those who, by not understanding God, said vain things about Him.

Chapter 14

(18) But even more testimonies about the love of God are found in the Divine Scriptures. For there the other two are also understood by inference, since nobody loves that which he does not remember and that of which he is completely ignorant. Wherefore, this is the best known and the principal commandment: "You shall love the Lord your God" [*Deuteronomy* 6:5]. Human nature, therefore, has been so formed that never does it not remember itself, never does it not understand itself, never does it not love itself. But since he who hates someone strives to injure him, the human mind is not undeservedly said to hate itself when it harms itself. For without knowing it, it wills evil to itself, since it does not believe that what it wills is harmful to itself; but yet it wills evil to itself when it wills what is harmful to itself; wherefore it is written: "He that loves iniquity, hates his own soul" [cf. *Psalm* 11:5].

Hence, he who knows how to love himself loves God; on the other hand, he who does not love God, even though he loves himself, insofar as that is naturally implanted in him, is not unfittingly said to hate himself, since he does that which is opposed to himself, and pursues himself as though he were his own enemy. This is certainly a tragic delusion that, though all wish to be useful to themselves, many only do what is most fatal to themselves. When describing a similar sickness among the dumb animals, the poet said: "May the gods grant better things to the godly, and that delusion to our foes! They were tearing their own mangled limbs with their naked teeth" [Virgil, *Georgics* 3.513–14]. Since he was referring here to a disease of the body, why did he call it a delusion, unless it were that though nature inclines every animal to protect itself as much as it can, yet that disease was such that they that desired health tore their own limbs?

But when the mind loves God and by consequence, as we have said, remembers and understands Him, then with respect to its neighbor it is rightly commanded to love him as it loves itself. For it no longer loves itself perversely but rightly when it loves God, by partaking of whom that image not only exists, but is also renewed so as not to grow old, reformed so as not to be disfigured, and beatified so as not to be unhappy. For although it so loves itself that, if the alternative is proposed to it, it would rather lose all that it loves less than itself than to perish, yet by abandoning Him who is above it – with Him alone it can preserve its strength and

enjoy His light, to Him it is sung in the Psalm: "I will keep my strength with thee" [cf. *Psalm* 59:9], and in another place: "Come to him and be enlightened" [cf. *Psalm* 34:5] – it has become so weak and so dark that it has unhappily slipped away even from itself into those things which are not itself and to which it itself is superior, through the affections which it cannot control, and the delusions from which it sees no way to return. Therefore, the penitent, who had already experienced the mercy of God, cries out in the Psalms: "My strength has abandoned me, and the light of my eyes is not with me" [cf. *Psalm* 38:10].

(19) Yet even amid these great evils, which reveal its weakness and delusions, it could not lose the natural memory, understanding, and love of itself, and, therefore, what I have mentioned above[16] could deservedly be said: "Although man walks in an image, yet he is disquieted in vain; he stores up and he knows not for whom he shall gather those things" [cf. *Psalm* 39:6]. Why does he store up if not because his strength has abandoned him, for with it he possessed God and was in want of nothing? And why does he not know for whom he shall gather them, save that the light of his eyes is not with him? And, therefore, he does not see what Truth has said: "Thou fool, this night do they demand thy soul of thee; and those things which thou hast provided, whose shall they be?" [cf. *Luke* 12:20]

Yet because even such a man walks in an image, and the mind of man preserves the memory, understanding, and love of itself, if it were made known to him that he could not have both, and would be permitted to choose one of the two, but to lose the other, that is to say, either the treasures which he had gathered or the mind, who would be so foolish-minded as to prefer to have the treasures rather than the mind? For treasures can generally lead the mind astray, but the mind which is not led astray by treasures can live more easily and more freely without any treasures. But who can possess any treasures except through the mind? For if a small boy, although born into the greatest wealth, since he is the master of everything that is rightly his, possesses nothing while his mind is still dormant, in what way, pray, can anyone possess something if he has lost his mind?

But why speak of treasures which any man, if such a choice were placed before him, would prefer to be without than without the mind, since nobody would prefer them, nobody would compare them to the lights of

[16] DT 14.4.6.

the body by which the heavens become the possession of every man, since by the lights of the body everyone possesses what he gladly sees, whereas only a man here and there possesses gold. If anyone, therefore, cannot have both and is forced to lose one of them, would he not prefer to lose his treasures than his eyes? And yet if a similar alternative were put to him, whether he would rather lose his eyes or his mind, who would not see in his mind that he would rather lose his eyes than his mind? For the mind without the eyes is still human, but the eyes of the body without the mind are those of a beast. Who, after all, would not prefer to be a man, even though blind in the body, than a beast that sees?

(20) I have spoken of these things, though but briefly, in order to remind even those who are slower of comprehension, before whose eyes or ears these writings may come, how much the mind, even though weak and erring, also loves itself by loving wrongly, and by pursuing things that are beneath it. Furthermore, it would be unable to love itself if it were altogether ignorant of itself, that is, if it did not remember itself nor understand itself; by which image of God in itself it is so powerful that it is able to cleave to Him whose image it is. For it has been so established in the order of natures, not of places, that no one save He is above it.

Finally, when it shall cleave to Him completely, it will be one spirit, and the Apostle bears witness to this when he says: "But he who cleaves to the Lord is one spirit" [cf. *1 Corinthians* 6:17], by drawing near, of course, in order to partake of that nature, truth, and blessedness, but yet without any increase in Him of His nature, truth, and blessedness. In that nature, therefore, to which the mind will blissfully adhere, it will live unchangeably, and all that it sees, it will see as unchangeable. Then, as the Divine Scripture promises, its desire will be satisfied with good things [cf. *Psalm* 103:5], with unchangeable goods, with the Trinity itself, its God, whose image it is; and that nothing may ever henceforth injure it, it will be in the secret of His face [cf. *Psalm* 31:20], so filled with His abundance that it will never find delight in committing sin. But now when it sees itself, it does not see anything unchangeable.

Chapter 15

(21) If, then, the mind certainly does not doubt that it is miserable and desires to be happy, it can have no other reason for hoping that this can be brought about, except that it is changeable. For if it were not changeable,

it would be just as impossible for it to pass from happiness to misery, as from misery to happiness. And what else could have made it miserable under the omnipotent and good God, except its own sin and the justice of its Lord? And what shall make it happy, except its own merit and the reward of its Lord? But its merit is also a grace from Him whose reward will also be its happiness. For it cannot give itself the justice which it has lost and no longer has, because man received it when he was made, and by sinning has certainly lost it. He receives justice, therefore, and on account of it he may merit to receive happiness. Wherefore the Apostle truly says to him who begins to boast as though it were from his own good: "For what hast thou that thou hast not received? And if thou hast received, why dost thou boast as though thou hast not received it?" [*1 Corinthians* 4:7]

When it rightly remembers its Lord, however, whose Spirit it has received, it feels with absolute certainty, because it learns this from an inward teaching, that it can only raise itself by the affection which He freely gives, and could only have fallen by the defection which it freely committed. It does not indeed remember its own happiness, for this has once been and is no longer, and it has completely forgotten it; and, therefore, it cannot be reminded of it. But it believes the Scriptures of its God that are worthy of faith and written by His prophet when they describe that happiness of paradise, and pass on to us the history of that first good and evil of man.

Yet the mind remembers the Lord its God. For He always is; nor has He been and is not; nor is He and has not been; but just as He never will not be, so never was He not. And He is whole everywhere, and on that account it loves, moves, and has its being in Him [cf. *Acts* 17:28], and, therefore, it can remember Him. Not because it recollects that it had known Him in Adam, or anywhere else before the life of this body, or when it was first created in order to be implanted in this body; for it remembers nothing at all of these things, and whatever there is of this has been blotted out by forgetfulness. But it is reminded that it should turn to the Lord as to that light by which it was touched in some way, even when it was turned away from Him. For hence it is that even the godless think of eternity, and rightly condemn and rightly praise many things in the moral conduct of men.

By what rules, pray, do they judge these things if not by those in which they see how each one ought to live, even though they themselves do not live in the same manner? Where do they see them? For they do not see them

in their own nature, since these things are doubtless in the mind, and their minds are admittedly changeable; but it sees these rules as unchangeable, whoever can see even this in them; nor does it see them in any state[17] of their mind, since these rules are the rules of justice, but their minds are admittedly unjust.

Where are these rules written in which even the unjust man recognizes what is just, and in which he perceives that he ought to have what he does not have? Where, then, are they written except in the book of that light which is called Truth? From thence every just law is transcribed and transferred to the heart of the man who works justice, not by wandering to it, but being as it were impressed upon it, just as the image from the ring passes over into the wax, and yet does not leave the ring. But he who does not work justice, and yet sees what is to be worked, he it is who is turned away from this light, but is still touched by it. But the sin of him who does not even see how he ought to live is indeed more excusable, since he is not a transgressor of a known law; but even such a one is at times touched by the splendor of the truth that is present everywhere when, upon being admonished, he confesses his sin.

Chapter 16

(22) But those who, when reminded, turn away from that disfigurement, by which they were conformed to this world by their worldly lusts, and turn to the Lord, are reformed by Him when they hear the Apostle say: "Be not conformed to this world, but be reformed in the newness of your mind" [cf. *Romans* 12:2], so that that image begins to be reformed by Him by whom it was formed. For it cannot reform itself as it could deform itself. For he also says elsewhere: "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, that has been created according to God in justice and holiness of truth" [*Ephesians* 4:23–24]. What he speaks of here as being created "according to God" is said in another place to be "to the image of God" [cf. *Genesis* 1:27].

But by committing sin it has lost justice and the holiness of truth, and on account of it this image has become disfigured and discolored; but it receives what it had once had when it is reformed and renewed. But he did not mean that two things were to be understood there when he said,

[17] *habitus.*

"in the spirit of your mind," as though the mind were one thing, and the spirit of the mind another thing, but because every mind is spirit, yet not every spirit is mind. For God is also spirit [cf. *John* 4:24], who cannot be renewed because He cannot grow old. There is likewise said to be a spirit in man which is not mind, to which belong the images formed according to the likeness of bodies; and he speaks about this to the Corinthians where he says: "But if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my mind is unfruitful" [cf. *1 Corinthians* 14:14]. For he speaks thus, when that which is said is not understood, because it cannot even be uttered, unless the images of corporeal sounds precede the oral sounds by the thought of the spirit.

The soul of man is also called "spirit," and hence the words of the Gospel: "And bowing his head, he gave up his spirit" [*John* 19:30], by which the death of the body is signified when the Soul departs. One also speaks of the spirit of the beast, and it is written most plainly in Ecclesiastes, the book of Solomon, where it is said: "Who knoweth if the spirit of the children of men ascend upward, and if the spirit of the beast descend downward to the earth?" [cf. *Ecclesiasticus* 3:21]. It is also written in Genesis, where it says that all flesh died in the flood "which had in it the spirit of life" [*Genesis* 7:22]. Even the wind is called spirit, and it is quite obviously something corporeal; and, therefore, we have that passage in the Psalms: "Fire, hail, snow, ice, the spirit of the tempest" [cf. *Psalm* 148:8]. Since spirit, then, has so many different meanings, he wished to signify by the spirit of the mind that spirit which is called mind.

As the same Apostle also says: "In putting off the body of the flesh" [cf. *Colossians* 2:11]. Now certainly he did not mean that two things are to be understood, as though the flesh were one thing, and the body of the flesh another thing; but he spoke thus because body is a name given to many things that have no flesh (for besides the flesh, there are many celestial and terrestrial bodies); he called the body of the flesh that body which is flesh; and so the spirit of the mind is that spirit which is mind. In another place he has also designated it more plainly by the name of image, namely, where he commands the same thing in different words: "Stripping yourself of the old man with his deeds, put on the new man, that is being renewed in the knowledge of God, according to the image of him who created him" [cf. *Colossians* 3:9–10].

Hence, what is read in that other place: "Put on the new man that has been created according to God," means the same as that which is said

in this place: "put on the new man, that is being renewed according to the image of him who created him." There he says "according to God," but here "according to the image of him who created him." Instead of the expression that he employed there "in justice and holiness of truth," he says here "in the knowledge of God." Consequently, this renewal and reformation of the mind is made according to God or according to the image of God. He says "according to God," therefore, that we might not think it to be made according to another creature; but "according to the image of God," therefore, that we might understand this renewal to be wrought in that thing where there is the image of God, namely, in the mind.

Thus we say that he who departs from the body as a faithful and just man is dead according to the body, not according to the soul. But why do we say that he is dead according to the body, except that he is dead as to the body or in the body, not as to the soul or in the soul? Or if we should say that he is beautiful according to the body, or strong according to the body, not according to the soul, what else do we mean than that he is beautiful or strong as to the body, not as to the soul? And we speak thus in numberless instances. Hence we should not so understand "according to the image of him who created him," as if the image, according to which the mind is renewed, is different from the mind, and as if it is not the mind itself that is renewed.

Chapter 17

(23) This renewal, of course, is not brought about in the one moment of the conversion itself, as in Baptism that renewal is brought about in one moment by the remission of all sins, for there does not remain even one sin, however small it may be, that is not forgiven. But just as it is one thing to be free from fevers, and another thing to recover from the weakness which has resulted from the fevers; and, similarly, just as it is one thing to remove a spear that has been driven into the body, and another thing to heal the wound that has been made by it through the treatment that follows, so the first step in a cure is to remove the cause of the disease, which is done through the remission of all sins; the second is to heal the disease itself, which is done gradually by making progress in the renewal of this image.

These two things are pointed out in the Psalm where we read: "Who forgives all thy faults," which takes place in Baptism; then it continues: "who heals all thy diseases" [*Psalm* 103:3], which takes place by daily additions when this image is renewed. The Apostle spoke quite plainly about this subject when he said: "Even though our outer man is decaying, yet our inner man is being renewed day by day" [*2 Corinthians* 4:16]. But he "is renewed in the knowledge of God," that is, "in justice and holiness of truth," according to the testimonies of the Apostle which I have cited shortly before.

Whoever, then, is being renewed in the knowledge of God, and in justice and holiness of truth, by making progress day by day, transfers his love from temporal to eternal things, from visible to intelligible things, from carnal to spiritual things, and constantly endeavors to restrain and to lessen the desire for the former, and to bind himself by love to the latter. But he does so in proportion to the divine help that he receives, for the saying of God is: "Without me you can do nothing" [*John* 15:5].

If the last day of this life shall find anyone in such progress and growth holding fast to the faith of the Mediator, he will be received by the holy angels, in order that he may be brought to the God whom he has worshiped, and by whom he is to be brought to perfection; and at the end of the world he shall receive an incorruptible body, not for punishment but for glory. For the likeness to God in this image will then be perfect when the vision of God will be perfect. The Apostle Paul says of this vision: "We now see through a mirror in an obscure manner, but then face to face" [*1 Corinthians* 13:12]. He likewise says: "But we, beholding the glory of the Lord with face unveiled, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as through the spirit of the Lord" [cf. *2 Corinthians* 3:18]. This is what takes place in those who are making progress steadily day by day.

Chapter 18

(24) The Apostle John says: "Dearly beloved, now we are the children of God, and it has not yet appeared what we shall be. But we know that, when he appears, we shall be like to him, for we shall see him just as he is" [*1 John* 3:2]. Hence, it is clear that the full likeness to God will then be realized in this image of God when it shall receive the full vision of

Him. And yet it is also possible to see in these words of John the Apostle a reference to the immortality of the body. For in this, too, we shall be like God, but only the Son, because He alone in the Trinity took a body, in which He died, rose again, and which He brought to higher things.

For this is also called an image of the Son of God, in which we as He shall have an immortal body, being conformed in this regard to the image, not of the Father, or of the Holy Spirit, but only of the Son, for of Him alone is it read and received by the most sound faith: "The Word was made flesh" [*John* 1:14]. And, therefore, the Apostle says: "Those whom he has foreknown he has also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he should be the firstborn among many brethren" [*Romans* 8:29].

The "firstborn," certainly "from the dead" [*Colossians* 1:18], according to the same Apostle; in this death His flesh was sown in dishonor and rose in glory. According to this image of the Son to which we are conformed through immortality in the body, we likewise do that which the same Apostle says: "As we have borne the image of the earthly, let us bear also the image of him who is from heaven" [cf. *1 Corinthians* 15:59]. That is to say, let us who were mortal according to Adam hold fast to this with a true faith and with a certain and firm hope that we shall be immortal according to Christ. For in this way we can now bear the same image, not yet in vision but in faith; not yet in reality but in hope. For the Apostle was then speaking of the resurrection of the body when he said these things.

Chapter 19

(25) But with respect to that image of which it was said: "Let us make man to our image and likeness" [*Genesis* 1:26]. We believe that man has been made image of the Trinity, because it was not said "to my" or "to your" image, and we comprehend this insofar as we have been able by our investigation. And, therefore, it is rather in this sense that we are also to understand what John the Apostle says: "We shall be like to him, for we shall see him just as he is"; because he, too, spoke of Him [i.e., of God the Trinity] of whom he had said: "We are the children of God" [*1 John*. 3:2].

And the immortality of the flesh will be perfected at that moment of the resurrection of which the Apostle Paul says: "In the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet, and the dead shall rise again incorruptible; and we shall

be changed" [cf. *1 Corinthians* 15:52]. For in the very twinkling of an eye, before the judgment, that will rise in power, incorruption, and glory as a spiritual body, which is now sown in weakness, corruption, and dishonor as a natural body. But the image which is being renewed day by day in the spirit of the mind and in the knowledge of God, not outwardly but inwardly, will be perfected by the vision itself which will then be after the judgment face to face, but it is making progress towards it now through a mirror in an obscure manner [*1 Corinthians* 15:52].

And the words: "we shall be like to him, for we shall see him just as he is," are to be understood as referring to the perfection of this image. For this gift will then be given to us when it shall be said: "Come, blessed of my Father, take possession of the kingdom prepared for you" [*Matthew* 25:34]. For the godless one shall then be taken away so that he shall not see the glory of the Lord [*Isaiah* 26:10], when those on the left shall go into eternal punishment, and those on the right into eternal life [cf. *Matthew* 25:46]. "But this is everlasting life," as Truth says, "that they may know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ" [*John* 17:3].

(26) At the end of his dialogue *Hortensius,* Cicero, commending this contemplative wisdom – I think the Sacred Scriptures properly call it "wisdom" to distinguish it from knowledge; it is, of course, the wisdom only of man, and indeed it does not come to him from himself, but from Him of whom the rational and intellectual mind can partake so as to be truly wise – says: "If we consider these things day and night, and sharpen our understanding, which is the eye of the mind, and take care that it never grows dull, that is, if we live in philosophy, there is great hope, that even though our sentiments and knowledge are mortal and transitory, yet a pleasant setting rather than a painful extinction and, as it were, a rest from life will be ours when we have discharged our human offices. But if, as the ancient philosophers agreed – and indeed the greatest and by far the most illustrious among them – that we have eternal and divine souls, then we must needs think, that the more they were always in their proper course, that is, in reason and in an eagerness for investigating, and the less they mingled with and became entangled in the vices and delusions of men, so much the easier would be their ascent and return to heaven." And then he adds this sentence which recapitulates and concludes his treatise: "Therefore, to end my discourse at last, if we wish either for a peaceful extinction when we have spent our life in the pursuit of these subjects,

or to migrate without delay from this home to another that is certainly much better, we must devote all our labor and care to these studies."

I marvel here that a man of such talent promises a pleasant setting upon the discharge of their human offices to those who have spent their lives in philosophy, which makes men happy by the contemplation of the truth, if our sentiments and knowledge are mortal and transitory, just as if this which we did not love, or rather fiercely hated, were then to die and be reduced to nothing so that its setting might be pleasant for us.

He had not learned this, however, from the philosophers, upon whom he lavishes such praise; it savors rather of that New Academy where it seemed proper to doubt even the most evident truths. But, as he himself admits, he had learned from the philosophers, "the greatest and by far the most illustrious," that souls are eternal. For eternal souls are not unfittingly aroused by this exhortation, so that they may be found in their proper course when the end of this life comes, that is, in reason and in the eagerness for investigating, and they mingle less and become less entangled in the vices and delusions of men, in order that their return to God may be easier. But this course, which consists in the love of God and in the search for the truth, does not suffice for the miserable, that is, for all mortals who rely on this reason alone without the faith of the Mediator; and I have taken pains to show this, insofar as I could, in the preceding books of this work, especially in the fourth and thirteenth.

Book 15

Outline

1. The previous fourteen books are summarized. (1.1–4.6)
2. The truth that God is perfectly simple is explained. (5.7–7.12)
3. For God all things are present. (7.13)
4. We must distinguish (a) bodily perception, (b) memory, and (c) the perception of eternal objects. (8.14–9.16)
5. We must distinguish written and spoken words, their mental images, and the thoughts they express. (10.17–11.21)
6. My indubitable knowledge that I live defeats skepticism. (12.21–22)
7. We return to God's absolute simplicity. (13.22)
8. We return to consider words and thoughts. (14.23–15.25)
9. The Christian message is restated. (16.25–28.51)

Chapter 1

Wanting to train the reader in the things that were made so that he might know Him by whom they were made, we have now at last arrived at His image, which is man. But it is man in that by which man is superior to other animals, namely, in reason and understanding, and whatever else can be said of the rational or intellectual soul that pertains to that thing which is called "mind" [*mens*] or "rational soul" [*animus*]. Several Latin authors, according to their own special terminology, called *animus* that which excels in man and is not in the beast, thus distinguishing it from *anima* which is also found in the beast.

If, then, we seek something above this nature, and seek it truly, then it is God, namely, a nature that is not created, but creates. We must now show whether this is the Trinity – not only to believers by the authority of the divine Scriptures, but also, if we are able, to those who seek to understand by some kind of reason. The subject-matter itself, once we begin to discuss what we are seeking, will indicate better why I said "if we are able."

Chapter 2

(2) For God Himself whom we are seeking will, as I hope, grant us His help, so that our labor may not be fruitless, and that we may understand why it was said in the holy Psalm: "Let the heart of those rejoice who seek the Lord; seek the Lord, and be strengthened; seek his face evermore" [cf. *Psalm* 105:3–4]. For it seems that what is always sought is never found; and how will the heart of those who seek then rejoice, and not rather be saddened, if they cannot find what they are seeking? For it does not say: "Let the heart of those rejoice who find," but "of those who seek the Lord." And yet the Prophet Isaiah testifies that the Lord God can be found while He is being sought, where he says: "Seek the Lord, and as soon as you find, call upon him; and when he shall come near you, let the wicked forsake his ways, and the unjust man his thoughts" [cf. *Isaiah* 55:6–7].

If, therefore, He who is sought can be found, why was it said: "Seek his face evermore?" Or is He perhaps still to be sought even when He is found? For so ought we to seek incomprehensible things, lest we should think that we have found nothing, who could find how incomprehensible is the thing which we are seeking. Why, then, does he so seek if he comprehends that what he seeks is incomprehensible, unless because he knows that he must not cease as long as he is making progress in the search itself of incomprehensible things, and is becoming better and better by seeking so great a good, which is sought in order to be found, and is found in order to be sought? For it is sought in order that it may be found sweeter, and is found in order that it may be sought more eagerly.

What is said in the Book of Ecclesiasticus can be understood in this sense where Wisdom says: "They that eat me, shall yet hunger, and they that drink me, shall yet thirst" [*Ecclesiasticus* 24:29]. For they eat and drink because they find; and because they eat and drink, they yet seek. Faith seeks; understanding finds; wherefore the Prophet says: "Unless you believe, you shall not understand" [cf. *Isaiah* 7:9]. And again the

understanding still seeks Him whom it has found, for as it is sung in the holy Psalm: "God has looked down upon the children of men, to see if there be one who understands and seeks God" [cf. *Psalm* 14:2]. For this reason, then, man ought to be understanding in order that he may seek God.

(3) We have, therefore, dwelt sufficiently on these things which God has made, so that He who made them might be known through them. "For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood through those things that are made" [cf. *Romans* 1:20]. Wherefore they are blamed in the Book of Wisdom "who by these good things that are seen, could not know him that is, neither by attending to the works have recognized the workman; but have imagined either the fire, or the wind, or the swift air, or the circle of the stars, or the turbulence of the waters, or the lights of heaven to be the gods that rule the world. With whose beauty, if they, being delighted, took them to be gods, let them know how much better is their Lord, for the author of beauty created them. Or if they admired their beauty and working, let them understand that he who established them is so much mightier than they. For by the greatness of the beauty and of the creature, the creator of these may be seen, so as to be known thereby" [cf. *Wisdom* 13:1–5]. I have cited these words from the Book of Wisdom, therefore, that no one of the faithful may think that I have labored in vain and to no purpose when, in my search for that highest Trinity which we seek when we seek God, I first sought traces of it in the creature, and proceeded, as it were, step by step through certain trinities of its own kind until I arrived at the mind of man.

Chapter 3

(4) The necessity of our argumentation and reasoning, therefore, compelled us to say many things in the course of these fourteen books which we were unable to view in their entirety at one and the same time. So, then, that we may refer them quickly in thought to that which we wish to grasp I shall, with the help of the Lord, have everything that I have made known by means of discussion in each of the books brought together briefly and without discussion, and shall place, as it were, under one gaze of the mind, not how each thing led to certain convictions, but the convictions themselves, in order that what follows may not be so far away from what precedes that the study of what follows may bring about the forgetfulness of what precedes, or, if this has already happened, then

what has escaped from the memory may be quickly recalled by reading them once again.

(5) In the *first* book the unity and equality of that highest Trinity is shown according to the Sacred Scriptures, and the same subject is continued in the *second*, *third*, and *fourth*. But in these three latter books, the question about the sending of the Son and the Holy Spirit is carefully studied; and it is shown that He who was sent is not, therefore, less than He who sends, because the latter sends and the former is sent, since the Trinity, which is equal in all things, and is also equally unchangeable in its nature, invisible, and present everywhere, works inseparably.

The *fifth* is concerned with those to whom it, therefore, seems that the substance of the Father and the Son is not the same. For they thought everything said of God to be said according to substance, and, therefore, claimed that, since to beget and to be begotten, or begotten and unbegotten are different terms, hence, their substances are different. Consequently, it is shown here that not everything said of God is said according to substance. According to substance He is said to be good and great, or whatever else is said of Him in respect to Himself; but that some things are also said of Him relatively, that is, not in respect to Himself, but to something that He Himself is not, as He is called the Father in relation to the Son, or the Lord in relation to the creature that serves Him. In the realm of creation, where anything thus predicated, that is, in relation to something which He Himself is not, also includes the idea of time, as when it is said: "O Lord, thou hast become a refuge for us" [cf. *Psalm* 90:1], nothing takes place in Him whereby He is changed, but He Himself continues altogether unchangeable in His own nature or essence.

In the *sixth*, how Christ was called by the mouth of the Apostle, the power of God and the Wisdom of God [cf. *1 Corinthians* 1:24] is discussed in such a way that a more careful study of the same question is put off until later: whether He, by whom Christ was begotten, is not Himself wisdom, but only the Father of His own wisdom, or whether wisdom begot wisdom. But whichever of these it might be, the equality of the Trinity, as well as that God is not three-fold but a Trinity, also appeared in this book. Nor are the Father and the Son, as it were, something double in relation to the single Holy Spirit, where the three are not something more than one of them. We likewise discussed how the words of Bishop Hilary can be understood: "Eternity in the Father, the form in the Image, and the use in the Gift."

In the *seventh*, the question that was deferred is explained in such a way that the God who begot the Son is not only the Father of His own power and wisdom, but is Himself also power and wisdom, and so, too, the Holy Spirit; but yet that they are not together three powers or three wisdoms, but one power and one wisdom, as one God and one essence. Then we inquired, how they may be called one essence, three persons, or by some Greek authors, one essence, three substances; and we found that we are compelled by necessity to speak in this manner, that so we might be able to answer in one word when anyone asks, what the three are whom we truly confess to be three, namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

In the *eighth*, it also became clear from the reasons which we gave for those capable of understanding that not only is the Father not greater than the Son in the substance of truth, but neither are both together something greater than the Holy Spirit alone, nor are any two something greater than one in the same Trinity, nor are all three together something greater than each one. After this I reminded them that the nature, not only incorporeal but also unchangeable which God is, might be understood, insofar as it can be understood, by the truth which is beheld by the understanding, by the highest good from which is every good, by the justice on account of which the just soul is also loved by a soul that is not yet just, and by love which, in the Sacred Scriptures, is called God [cf. *John* 4:16] – by which those who have understanding also begin to discern, however it may be, the Trinity, namely, the lover, what is loved, and love.

Our discussion in the *ninth* book brought us to the image of God, which man is according to the mind, and we found a kind of trinity in it, namely, the mind, and the knowledge by which it knows itself, and the love by which it loves itself and its knowledge; and we pointed out that these three are equal among themselves, and are of the one essence. We treated this subject more carefully and more precisely in the *tenth* book, and this brought us to an even more evident trinity in the mind, that is, in the memory, understanding, and will. But we also made this discovery: that the mind could never be so that it would not always remember itself, understand itself, and love itself, even though it would not be always thinking of itself, and that even when it did think of itself, it did not always separate itself in the same thought from corporeal things. Hence, we put off the discussion about the Trinity of which this is the image, in order that a trinity might also be found in

the corporeal things themselves, where the reader's mind could be more suitably exercised.

For this reason we chose the sense of sight in the *eleventh* book, since what we found in it could also be recognized in the other four senses of the body, even though we did not mention them. And so the trinity of the outer man appeared, first of all, in those things that are perceived without, that is, from the body that is seen, from the form imprinted thereby in the gaze of the beholder, and from the attention of the will which combines both. But these three, as is obvious, are not equal among themselves nor of one substance. Next we discussed another trinity in the mind itself, introduced as it were, by those things that were perceived without, where the three things appeared to be of the one substance, that is, the image of the body which is in the memory, the form thence impressed when the gaze of thought is turned to it, and the attention of the will which joins both together. But this trinity, therefore, as we discovered, also pertains to the outer man, because it was brought in from the corporeal things that are perceived without.

In the *twelfth*, it was seen that wisdom is to be distinguished from knowledge, and in that which is properly called knowledge because it is inferior, a certain trinity of its own kind is first to be sought; and although it already pertains to the inner man, still it is not yet to be called or to be regarded as the image of God. And this subject is treated in the *thirteenth* book by the commendation of the Christian faith. But in the *fourteenth*, we discussed the true wisdom of man, namely, the wisdom given by a gift of God in the partaking of that very God Himself, which is distinct from knowledge. Our argument has now progressed so far that the Trinity appears in the image of God, which is man according to the mind;[1] this is being renewed in the knowledge of God, according to the image of Him who created man [cf. *Colossians* 3:10] according to His own image [cf. *Genesis* 1:27], and so perceives wisdom which consists in the contemplation of eternal things.

Chapter 4

(6) Then let us now seek the Trinity that is God in the eternal, incorporeal, and unchangeable things themselves, in the perfect contemplation of

[1] *homo secundum mentem.*

which the blessed life,[2] which is none other than eternal life, is promised to us. For not only does the authority of the divine Books proclaim that there is a God, but the whole nature of the universe itself, which surrounds us and to which we also belong, cries aloud that it has the most exalted Creator of all, who has given us a mind as well as a natural reason, whereby we see that living are to be preferred to non-living things, things endowed with sensation to those without sensation, intelligible to non-intelligible things, immortal to mortal things, powerful to helpless things, just to unjust things, beautiful to deformed things, good to bad things, incorruptible to corruptible things, unchangeable to changeable things, invisible to visible things, incorporeal to corporeal things, and blessed to wretched things. And, therefore, since we doubtless prefer the Creator to created things, we must confess that He lives in the highest sense, that He perceives all things, and understands all things; that it is impossible for Him to die, to be corrupted, or to be changed; that He is not a body, but the most powerful, the most just, the most beautiful, and the most blessed spirit of all.

Chapter 5

(7) All these things that I have said, and whatever other things seem to be worthily predicated of God in the like manner of human speech, are appropriate to the whole Trinity which is the one God, and to each Person in the same Trinity. For who would venture to say either that the one God, which is the Trinity itself, or that the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit is not living, or is lacking in perception or understanding, or that in that nature by which they are proclaimed to be mutually equal, any one of them is mortal, or corruptible, or changeable, or corporeal? Or who would deny that any one there is the most powerful, the most just, the most beautiful, the best, and the most blessed? If, then, these and all other things of this kind can be predicated both of the Trinity itself and of each one in it, where or in what manner will the Trinity appear?

[2] *beata vita*. In this final book of DT most occurrences of *beatus* will be rendered as "blessed" rather than as "happy" and *beatitudo* will be generally be rendered as "blessedness." Back in Book 13 Augustine had made use of the ordinary claim, which he himself endorsed, that everyone wants to be *beatus*. Since it would be implausible to claim, as a truism, that everyone wants to be blessed, occurrences of *beatus* were there rendered as "happy." But here in Book 15, Augustine assumes a religious context in which it is natural to speak of the blessedness of God, rather than the happiness of God, and the hope that human beings have, not just to be happy, but also blessed. Hence "blessed" will be the default translation of *beatus* in this final book.

Let us first of all, therefore, reduce these many things to a small number. For what is called "life" in God is itself His essence and nature. God, then, does not live except by the life which He Himself is to Himself. But this life is not such as is within a tree, where there is no understanding and no sensation. Nor is it such as is in a beast, for the life of a beast has the five-fold sense, but it has no understanding; but that life which God is, perceives and understands all things, and it perceives in a mind, not in a body, because God is spirit [cf. *John* 4:24]. But not as animals which have bodies does God perceive through a body, for He does not consist of soul and body, and, therefore, that simple nature, as it understands, so it perceives, as it perceives, so it understands, and in it perception is the same as understanding. Nor is this nature such that at one time it should either cease to be, or begin to be, for it is immortal. Not without reason has it been said of Him that He alone has immortality [cf. *1 Timothy* 6:16]; for His immortality is true immortality, in whose nature there is no change.

That is also true eternity, by which God is unchangeable, without beginning and without end; consequently, He is also incorruptible. For one and the same thing is, therefore, said, whether God is called eternal, or immortal, or incorruptible, or unchangeable; and similarly, when He is called living and understanding – to be understanding is certainly to be wise – one and the same thing is said. For He has not obtained the wisdom by which He is wise, but He Himself is wisdom. And this life is the same as this strength or this power, and the same as this beauty by which He is called powerful and beautiful. For what is more powerful and more beautiful than wisdom which reaches from end to end mightily and disposes all things sweetly? [cf. *Wisdom* 8:1] Or again are goodness and justice also different from each other in the nature of God, as they are different in their works, as if they were two different qualities of God, one His goodness and the other His justice? Certainly not! But that which is justice is the same as goodness, and that which is goodness is the same as blessedness. And God is, therefore, called incorporal or incorporeal, in order that He may be believed or understood to be a Spirit and not a body.

(8) Hence, if we say: "He is eternal, immortal, incorruptible, unchangeable, living, wise, powerful, beautiful, just, good, blessed, and spirit," only the last of these designations [namely "spirit"] seems to signify substance, but the rest to signify qualities of this substance; but it is not so in that ineffable and simple nature. For whatever seems to be said there according

to qualities is to be understood according to substance or essence. For, far be it from us to say that God is spirit according to substance, and good according to quality; but both are said according to substance. And the same is to be understood of all the others that we have mentioned, and about which we have already said many things in the preceding books.

Of the first four that we have enumerated and arranged, namely, that He is eternal, immortal, incorruptible, and unchangeable, let us then choose one, because these four have one meaning as I have already explained; and that our attention may not be distracted by many things, let us rather choose the one that I have set down first, namely, that He is eternal. Let us also do the same with the second four, which are that He is living, wise, powerful and beautiful. And since life of whatever kind is also in a beast which is lacking in wisdom, and since the next two, that is, wisdom and power, are so compared to each other in man that Sacred Scripture could say: "A wise man is better than a strong man" [*Wisdom* 6:1]; and, finally, since bodies are also wont to be called beautiful, therefore, of these four which we have chosen, let wisdom be the one that we take, although these four are not to be spoken of as unequal in God, for there are four names, but the thing is one. With regard to the third and last series of fours, although in God to be just is the same as to be good and blessed, and it is the same for Him to be a spirit as it is to be just, good, and blessed, yet because in men there can be a spirit that is not blessed, and a spirit that can be just and good and not yet blessed; but, on the contrary, he who is blessed is certainly good, and just, and a spirit, let us rather choose that which cannot be in men without the other three, namely, that he is blessed.

Chapter 6

(9) When we, therefore, say: "He is eternal, wise and blessed," are these three the Trinity which is called God? We have indeed reduced those twelve to this small number, but perhaps we can even reduce these three in the same way to one of them. For if in the nature of God, wisdom and power, or life and wisdom can be one and the same thing, why cannot eternity and wisdom, or blessedness and wisdom be one and the same thing in the nature of God? And, therefore, just as it made no difference whether we spoke of those twelve or these three when we reduced those many things to this small number, so it makes no difference whether we speak of those

three or of this one, to the singleness of which, as we have shown, the other two of the three can be reduced in a similar manner.

What method of arguing, then, what power and strength of understanding, what liveliness of reason, what penetration of thought will show – to say nothing now of other things – how this one thing, that God is called Wisdom, is a Trinity? For God does not receive it from someone as we receive wisdom from Him; but He is Himself His own wisdom, because His Wisdom is not one thing, and His essence another thing, to whom to be is the same as to be wise. Christ is indeed called the power of God and the wisdom of God in the Sacred Scriptures [cf. *1 Corinthians* 1:24], but we have explained in the seventh book[3] in what sense these words are to be understood, in order that the Son may not seem to make the Father wise; and reason brought us to this conclusion, that the Son is wisdom of wisdom in the same way as He is light of light, and God of God. Nor could we find the Holy Spirit to be anything else, except that He Himself is also wisdom, and all together are one wisdom, as they are one God and one essence. This Wisdom, then, which is God, how do we understand it to be a Trinity? I did not say "How do we believe?" for this ought not to be questioned among the faithful; but if there is any way by which we can see by our understanding what we believe, what will that way be?

(10) If we recall where the Trinity first began to be visible to our understanding in these books, the eighth comes to mind. For it was there that we tried, as we could, to raise the aim of our mind to understand that most excellent and unchangeable nature which our mind is not. But we so contemplated it that it was not far from us, and at the same time was above us, not in place, but by its own venerable and marvelous excellence, in such a way that its own light seemed to be present about us. But the Trinity still did not appear to us in it, for in the midst of that splendor we could not keep the eye of our mind fixed steadily upon it in order to search for it; for we only perceived in some way or other that it did not have material bulk, where we would have to believe that the greatness of two or three is more than that of one.

When we came to love, however, which God is called in Sacred Scripture [*1 John* 4:16], the Trinity began to dawn a little, that is, the lover, what is loved, and love. But because that ineffable light caused us to turn aside

[3] DT 7.1–3.

our gaze, and the weakness of our mind was convinced, so to say, that it could not yet adjust itself to it, we reversed the course which we had begun, and in order to relieve our overstrained attention drew up another plan in keeping with the, as it were, more familiar consideration of our own mind, according to which man has been made to the image of God [cf. *Genesis* 1:27]; and then from the ninth to the fourteenth book we dwelt upon the creature which we are, in order that we might be able to perceive the invisible things of God which are understood through those that are made [cf. *Romans* 1:20].

Behold us now, after we have exercised our understanding as much as was necessary, or perhaps more than was necessary in these lower things: we wish to raise ourselves to behold the highest Trinity, which is God, and we are unable to do so. Or is it perhaps that, as we see most certain trinities, whether those which are wrought from without by corporeal things, or when those same things which were perceived without are thought, or whether when those which arise in the mind and do not pertain to the senses of the body, such as faith, such as the virtues, which teach us the art of living, are perceived by evident reason and are retained by knowledge; or whether when the mind itself, by which we know whatever we say truly that we know, is known to itself or thinks of itself; or whether when it beholds something eternal and unchangeable which itself is not; is it, therefore, that as we see most certain trinities in all these things, because they are either wrought within us or are in us when we remember them, behold them, and will them, so in some such way we also see the Trinity that is God, because there by our understanding we also behold Him, as it were, speaking, and His Word, that is, the Father and the Son, and the Love preceding from them and common to both, namely, the Holy Spirit?

Or is it that we see rather than believe those trinities pertaining to our senses or our mind, whereas we believe rather than see that God is Trinity? But if this is so, then it must surely be, either that we do not see His invisible things at all through those that are made, or else if we do see any of them, we do not see the Trinity in them, so that there are things there which we see, and things which we also do not see, and, therefore, must believe.

The eighth book showed that we behold an unchangeable good which we are not; and the fourteenth reminded us of this when we spoke of the

wisdom which man has from God. Why, then, do we not recognize the Trinity there? Or does this Wisdom, which is called God, not understand itself and not love itself? Who would say such a thing? Or who is there who does not see that where there is no knowledge, there can also be no wisdom? Or are we to think that the Wisdom which God is, knows other things and does not know itself, or loves other things and does not love itself? And if it is absurd and impious to say or to believe such things, then, behold, there is a trinity, namely, wisdom, the knowledge of itself, and the love of itself. For so do we find a trinity in man, that is, the mind, and the knowledge by which it knows itself, and the love by which it loves itself.

Chapter 7

(11) These three things are in man in such a way that they themselves are not man. For man, as the ancients defined him, is a rational, mortal animal. These three, therefore, excel in man, but they themselves are not man. And one person, that is, each individual man has these three in his mind. But even if we so define man as to say: "Man is a rational substance consisting of soul and body," there is no doubt that man has a soul which is not body, and a body which is not soul; and, therefore, these three are not man, but belong to man or are in man. Even if the body is set aside and the soul alone is considered, the mind is something of it, as it were, its head, or its eye, or its countenance, but we should not think of these things as bodies. Not the soul [*anima*], therefore, but that which excels in the soul is called "mind" [*mens*]. Can we say, however, that the Trinity is so in God, that it is something of God, but that itself is not God?

Therefore each individual man, who is not called the image of God according to everything that pertains to his nature but according to the mind alone, is one person and is the image of the Trinity in his mind. But that Trinity itself, of which the mind is an image, is nothing else in its totality than God, nothing else in its totality than Trinity. Nor does anything pertain to the nature of God which does not pertain to that Trinity; and the three Persons are of one essence, but not as each individual man is one person.

(12) Furthermore, even in this point there is a great difference, so that whether we speak of the mind in man and of its knowledge and love, or of memory, understanding, and will, we remember nothing of the mind except through the memory, nor understand except through the

understanding, nor love except through the will. But in that Trinity who would dare to say that the Father understands neither Himself, nor the Son, nor the Holy Spirit except by the Son, or that He does not love except by the Holy Spirit, but that by Himself He only remembers Himself, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit; and in the same way that the Son does not remember Himself, nor the Father except by the Father, or that He does not love except by the Holy Spirit, but that by Himself He only knows the Father, and Himself, and the Holy Spirit; and similarly, that the Holy Spirit remembers the Father, and the Son, and Himself by the Father, and that He understands the Father, and the Son, and Himself by the Son, but that by Himself He only loves Himself, and the Father, and the Son, just as though the Father were the memory of Himself, as well as of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and as though the Son were the understanding of Himself, as well as of the Father and the Holy Spirit, but as though the Holy Spirit were the love of Himself, as well as of the Father and the Son?

Who would presume to think or to affirm such things as these about that Trinity? For if there the Son alone understands for Himself, as well as for the Father and the Holy Spirit, then we return to that ridiculous opinion that the Father is not wise by Himself, but by the Son, and that wisdom has not begotten wisdom, but that the Father is said to be wise by that wisdom which He has begotten. For there can be no wisdom where there is no understanding, and consequently, if the Father Himself does not understand for Himself, but the Son understands for the Father, then certainly the Son makes the Father wise. And if for God to be is the same as to be wise, and to Him essence is the same as wisdom, then it is not the Son who has His essence from the Father, which is true, but the Father who has His essence from the Son, which is most absurd and most false. Our discussion, refutation, and repudiation of this ridiculous opinion are seen very clearly in the seventh book.[4]

God the Father is, therefore, wise by that whereby He is Himself His own wisdom; and the Son is the wisdom of the Father, from the wisdom which is the Father, from whom the Son was begotten. Hence it follows logically that the Father is also understanding, by that whereby He is Himself His own understanding, for He would not be wise who was not understanding. But the Son is the understanding of the Father, begotten

[4] DT 7.1–3.

by the understanding which is the Father. And the same can be also not unfittingly said of memory. For how is he wise who remembers nothing, or who does not remember himself?

Wherefore, because the Father is wisdom, and the Son wisdom, as the Father remembers Himself, so too does the Son; and as the Father remembers Himself and the Son, not by the memory of the Son, but by His own, so too the Son remembers Himself and the Father, not by the memory of the Father, but by His own. Who would say that there is any wisdom where love does not even exist? From this we conclude that the Father is His own love, in the same manner as He is His own understanding and His own memory. Behold these three, therefore: memory, understanding, love or the will, in that highest and unchangeable essence, which is God, and these three are not the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, but the Father alone.

Because the Son also is wisdom begotten from wisdom, as neither the Father nor the Holy Spirit understands for Him, but He Himself understands for Himself, so neither does the Father remember for Him, nor does the Holy Spirit love for Him, but He remembers for Himself and loves for Himself. For He Himself is also His own memory, His own understanding, and His own love; but that He is so, comes to Him from that Father of whom He was born. The Holy Spirit, too, because He is wisdom proceeding from wisdom, does not have the Father as His memory, and the Son as His understanding, and Himself as love; for He would not be wisdom if the one remembered for Him, and the other understood for Him, and He Himself only loved for Himself; but He has these three things, and so has them that He Himself is these three things. But that He is so, comes to Him from Him from whom He proceeds.

(13) What man, therefore, can comprehend that wisdom by which God knows all things, and in such a way that what are called past things are not past for Him, nor does He await the coming of what are called future things as though they were absent, but both past and future things are all present together with present things? He does not think of each thing by itself, nor pass in thought from one to another, but sees all of them present before Him in a single glance. What man, I say, comprehends that wisdom, that foresight, and that knowledge, seeing that we are unable even to comprehend our own?

For we can perceive in some way or other those things which are present either to our senses or to our understanding, but we know those which

are absent, and yet had been present through our memory, insofar as we have not forgotten them. We do not conjecture the past from the future, but the future from the past, yet not with a sure knowledge. For we, as it were, see some of our thoughts about future things more clearly and more certainly, as though they were very near; and we do this when we are able and insofar as we are able, by our memory which seems to pertain not to the future but to the past. This can be proved by those sayings and hymns which we render from memory in the proper sequence. For unless we foresaw in our thought what follows, we certainly could not utter them. And yet it is memory, not foresight, that enables us to foresee them. For as long as we continue to speak or to sing, we utter nothing except what we have foreseen and anticipated. And yet when we do so, we do not say that we sing or speak from foresight, but from memory; and those who are specially gifted in reciting many things in this way are wont to be praised, not for their foresight, but for their memory.

We know that these things are done in our mind or by our mind, and we are quite certain about them; but the more attentively we seek to consider how they are done, so much the more does our language fail us, and our attention itself does not continue, so that our understanding, if not our tongue, may reach some point of clearness. And do we, whose minds are so feeble, believe that we can comprehend whether God's foresight is the same as His memory and understanding, who does not behold individual things by thought, but embraces all that He knows in one eternal, unchangeable, and ineffable vision? In this difficulty and distress, therefore, we may indeed cry aloud to the living God: "Thy knowledge is become wonderful to me; it is sublime, and I cannot reach to it" [cf. *Psalm* 139:6]. For I understand from myself how wonderful and how incomprehensible Your knowledge is, by which You have made me, when I consider that I cannot even comprehend myself whom You have made; and yet in my meditation a fire flames out [cf. *Psalm* 39:3], so that I seek Your face evermore [cf. *Psalm* 105:4].

Chapter 8

(14) I know that wisdom is an incorporeal substance, and a light in which those things are seen that are not seen with carnal eyes, and yet a man so great and so spiritual has said: "We see now through a mirror in an enigma, but then face to face" [cf. *1 Corinthians* 13:12]. If we inquire what

this mirror is, and of what sort it is, the first thing that naturally comes to mind is that nothing else is seen in a mirror except an image. We have, therefore, tried to do this in order that through this image which we are, we might see Him by whom we have been made in some manner or other, as through a mirror. Such is also the meaning of the words spoken by the same Apostle: "But we, with face unveiled, beholding the glory of God, are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory, as through the Spirit of the Lord" [*2 Corinthians* 3:18]. He uses the word *speculantes*, that is, beholding through a mirror [*speculum*], not looking out from a watch-tower [*specula*]. There is no ambiguity here in the Greek language, from which the Epistles of the Apostle were translated into Latin. For there the word for mirror, in which the images of things appear, and the word for watch-tower, from the height of which we see something at a greater distance, are entirely different even in sound; and it is quite clear that the Apostle was referring to a mirror and not to a watch-tower when he said "beholding the glory of the Lord"; but when he says: "we are transformed into the same image," he undoubtedly means the image of God, since he calls it the "same image," that is, the very one which we are beholding; for the same image is also the glory of God, as he says elsewhere: "A man ought not to cover his head, because he is the image and glory of God" [*1 Corinthians* 11:7]. We have already explained the meaning of these words in the twelfth book. Therefore, he says "we are transformed," that is, changed from one form into another, and we pass from an obscure form to a bright form, for though obscure, yet it is the image of God; and if the image, then certainly also the glory in which we were created as men, surpassing other animals.

It was said of this human nature itself: "A man ought not to cover his head, because he is the image and glory of God" [*1 Corinthians* 11:7]. And when this nature, the most excellent in created things, is justified from its impiety by its own Creator, it is transferred from a deformed form into a beautiful form. For even in its very impiety, the more its vice is deserving of condemnation, so much the more certainly is its nature deserving of praise. And, therefore, he added these words "from glory to glory," namely, from the glory of creation to the glory of justification. Although the words "from glory to glory" may be also understood in other ways, such as, from the glory of faith to the glory of sight, from the glory by which we are the sons of God into the glory by which we shall be like Him, since we shall see Him just as He is [*1 John* 3:2].

But where he added "as through the Spirit of the Lord," he shows that the good of so desirable a transformation is conferred upon us by the grace of God.

Chapter 9

(15) We have spoken about these things because of what the Apostle has said: "We see now through a mirror." But since he added "in an enigma," his meaning is unknown to many who are ignorant of that branch of literature in which these modes of speech are taught; they are called "tropes" by the Greeks, and we ourselves also use this Greek word in place of the Latin. For just as we are more accustomed to say *schemata* than figures, so we are more accustomed to say "tropes" instead of "modes." But to render the names of all the modes or tropes in Latin, so as to apply to each word its appropriate name, is very difficult and quite unusual. Therefore, some of our interpreters, reluctant to use the Greek word where the Apostle says "which are by way of allegory" [cf. *Galatians* 4:24], have translated it by a circumlocution, saying "those which signify one thing by another." But there are very many species of this trope or allegory, and among them is that which is also called an enigma.

The definition of a generic term itself must include all the species. And, therefore, just as every horse is an animal, but not every animal is a horse, so every enigma is an allegory, but not every allegory is an enigma. What, then, is an allegory except a trope in which one thing is understood from another, as when he writes to the Thessalonians: "Therefore, let us not sleep as do the rest, but let us be wakeful and sober. For they who sleep, sleep at night, and they who are drunk are drunk at night. But let us, who are of the day, be sober"? [*1 Thessalonians* 5:6–8] This allegory, however, is not an enigma, for unless one is very slow of comprehension, its meaning is clear. But, to explain it briefly, an enigma is an obscure allegory, such as: "The horseleech has three daughters" [cf. *Proverbs* 30:15], and whatever expressions are similar to this. But where the Apostle speaks of the allegory, he finds it not in the words but in the deed; for he pointed out that by the two sons of Abraham, the one by a slave-girl and the other by a free woman – he was not speaking figuratively, but of something that also took place – the two Testaments are to be understood; this was obscure before he explained it, and, hence, such an allegory, which is a general name, could also be specially called an "enigma."

(16) Yet because not only they who are ignorant of those books from which tropes are learned seek the meaning of what the Apostle said, that we now see in an enigma, but also they who do know, yet are eager to know what that enigma is in which we now see, we must find a single meaning for both, namely, for that which says "we see now through a mirror," and that which adds "in an enigma." For it has one meaning when the whole is so uttered: "We see now through a mirror in an enigma." Therefore, it seems to me, as he would have us understand an image by the word "mirror," so a likeness by the word "enigma," yet a likeness that is obscure and difficult to perceive. Since by the terms image and enigma, therefore, any likenesses whatsoever intended by the Apostle can be understood, which are suited to lead to an understanding of God in the manner that is now possible, yet nothing is better suited than what is not unreasonably spoken of as His image.

Let no one wonder, therefore, that we must labor to see anything at all, even in this manner of seeing, which has been granted in this life, namely, through a mirror in an enigma. For the word "enigma" would not be used here if this seeing were something easy. And this is a greater enigma, that we do not see what is impossible for us not to see. For who does not see his own thought? And who does see his own thought, not I say with the eyes of flesh, but with the interior gaze itself? Who does not see it, and who does see it? For in thought we look, so to say, into our own mind, whether those things are present which we also see with our bodily eyes or perceive through the other senses, or whether they are not present, and their likenesses are seen in thought; or whether it is neither of these, but we think of those things that are neither corporeal nor the likenesses of bodies, such as the virtues and the vices, as, in a word, thought itself is thought; or whether we reflect upon those things which we have learned through the study of the sciences and the liberal arts; or whether our thoughts are directed to the higher causes or reasons of all those things which exist in an unchangeable nature; or whether we also think of evil, vain, and false things, either with the sense not consenting, or going astray by its consent.

Chapter 10

(17) Let us now speak of those things we think of as known, and have in our knowledge even if we do not think of them, whether they belong

to the contemplative knowledge, which, as I have explained, is to be properly called "wisdom," or to the active knowledge that is to be properly called "knowledge." For both together belong to the one mind and are the one image of God. But when we discuss the inferior part of the mind specifically and by itself, it is not to be called an image of God, even though, as we pointed out in the thirteenth book [chapter 1], some likeness of the Trinity is found in it.

Now, then, we are speaking of the whole knowledge of man together, in which whatever things are known, are known to us, and certainly they are true; otherwise, they would not be known. For no one knows false things, except when he knows them to be false, and if he knows this, then he knows the truth, for it is true that they are false. We are now discussing those things, therefore, which we think of as known, and which are known to us, even if we are not thinking of them. But, of course, if we wish to utter them, we cannot do so except by thinking of them. For, even though no words are sounded, yet he who thinks certainly speaks them in his heart.

Therefore, it is said in the Book of Wisdom: "They said within themselves, not thinking rightly" [*Wisdom* 2:1]. For it explained the meaning of "they said within themselves," when it added "thinking." A similar text is also found in the Gospel: "Take courage, son; thy sins are forgiven thee. And behold, some of the Scribes said within themselves, 'This man blasphemes.'" For what does "they said within themselves" mean, except they thought? Then it continues: "And when Jesus had seen their thoughts, he said, 'Why do you think evil in your hearts?'" [cf. *Matthew* 9:2–4] Such is Matthew's account. But Luke describes the same incident as follows: "The Scribes and Pharisees began to think, saying, 'Who is this man who speaks blasphemies? Who can forgive sins except God alone?' But as Jesus knew their thoughts, He answered and said to them, 'Why do you think in your hearts?'" [cf. *Luke* 5:21–22] "They said, thinking" of the Book of Wisdom is equivalent to "they thought, saying," of the Gospel. Both there and here, it is indicated that they speak within themselves and in their hearts, that is, they speak by thinking. For they said within themselves, and it was said to them: "Why do you think?" And the Lord Himself says of that rich man whose field brought forth an abundant harvest: "And he thought within himself, saying" [cf. *Luke* 12:17].

(18) Some thoughts, then, are speeches of the heart, and that a mouth is also there is shown by the Lord when He says: "What goes into the mouth doth not defile a man, but what comes out of the mouth, that defiles a

man." In one sentence he has included the two different mouths of man, the one of the body, the other of the heart. For certainly these people thought that a man is defiled by that which enters the mouth of the body, but the Lord said that a man is defiled by that which comes out of the mouth of the heart. Such was the explanation that He Himself gave of what He had said. For a little later He spoke of this subject to His disciples: "Are you also even yet without understanding? Do you not understand that whatever enters the mouth, passes into the belly and is cast out into the drain?" Here indeed He referred very clearly to the mouth of the body. But He indicates the mouth of the heart in that which follows: "But the things that proceed out of the mouth come from the heart, and it is they that defile a man. For out of the heart come evil thoughts", etc. [cf. *Matthew* 15:10–20]. What clearer explanation can there be than this? Yet because we speak of thoughts as speeches of the heart, we do not, therefore, mean that they are not at the same time acts of sight, which arise from the sights of knowledge when they are true.

When these take place outwardly through the body, then speech is one thing and sight another thing; but when we think inwardly, then both are one. Just as hearing and sight are two things, differing from each other in the senses of the body, but in the mind it is not one thing to see and another thing to hear; and, therefore, although speech is not seen outwardly, but is rather heard, yet the Holy Gospel says that the inner speeches, that is, the thoughts, were seen by the Lord and not heard: "They said within themselves, 'He blasphemes,'" and then it adds: "And when Jesus had seen their thoughts." He saw, therefore, what they had said. For by His own thought He saw their thoughts which they alone thought that they saw.

(19) Whoever, then, can understand the word, not only before it sounds, but even before the images of its sound are contemplated in thought – such a word belongs to no language, that is, to none of the so-called national languages, of which ours is Latin – whoever, I say, can understand this, can already see through this mirror and in this enigma some likeness of that Word of whom it was said: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God; and the Word was God" [*John* 1:1].

For when we speak the truth, that is, speak of what we know, then the word which is born from the knowledge itself which we retain in the memory must be altogether of the same kind as that knowledge from which it is born. For the thought formed from that thing which we know is the word which we speak in our heart, and it is neither Greek, nor Latin,

nor of any other language, but when we have to bring it to the knowledge of those to whom we are speaking, then some sign is assumed by which it may be made known. And generally this is a sound, but at times also a nod; the former is shown to the ears, the latter to the eyes, in order that that word which we bear in our mind may also become known by bodily signs to the senses of the body. For even to nod, what else is it but to speak, as it were, in a visible manner? A witness for this opinion is found in the Sacred Scriptures, for we read as follows in the Gospel according to John: "Amen, amen I say to you, one of you shall betray me. The disciples therefore looked at one another, uncertain of whom he was speaking. Now one of his disciples, he whom Jesus loved, was reclining at Jesus' bosom. Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him, and said to him, "Who is it of whom he speaks" [*John* 13:21–24]. Behold, he spoke by beckoning what he did not venture to speak aloud. But we make use of these and other corporeal signs of this kind when we speak to the eyes or the ears of those who are present. But letters have also been invented by which we can also speak to those who are absent; but the letters are the signs of words, while the words themselves in our speech are signs of the things of which we are thinking.

Chapter 11

(20) Hence, the word which sounds without is a sign of the word that shines within, to which the name "word"[5] more properly belongs. For that which is produced by the mouth of the flesh is the sound of the word, and is itself also called "word," because that inner word assumed it in order that it might appear outwardly. For just as our word in some way becomes a bodily sound by assuming that in which it may be manifested to the senses of men, so the Word of God was made flesh by assuming that in which He might also be manifested to the senses of men. And just as our word becomes a sound and is not changed into a sound, so the Word of God indeed becomes flesh, but far be it from us that it should be changed into flesh. For by assuming it, not by being consumed in it, this word of ours becomes a sound, and that Word became flesh.

Whoever, then, desires to arrive at some kind of a likeness to the Word of God, although unlike it in many things, let him not behold our word

[5] *verbum.*

which sounds in the ears, either when it is brought forth in sound, or when it is thought in silence. For all words, no matter in what language they may sound, are also thought in silence; and hymns run through our mind, even when the mouth of the body is silent; not only the numbers of the syllables, but also the melodies of the hymns, since they are corporeal and belong to that sense of the body called "hearing," are present by their own kind of incorporeal images to those who think of them, and silently turn all of them over in their minds.

But we must pass by these things in order to arrive at that word of man, for by its likeness, of whatever sort it may be, the Word of God may in some manner be seen as in an enigma: not that which was spoken to this or that Prophet, and of which it was said: "But the word of God increased and multiplied" [cf. *Acts* 6:7], and of which it was again said: "Faith then by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ" [cf. *Romans* 10:17], and again: "When you received from us the word of God, you received it not as the word of man, but, as it truly is, the word of God" [cf. *1 Thessalonians* 2:13]. There are numberless instances in the Scriptures where similar statements are made about the word of God, which is scattered in the sounds of many different languages through the hearts and mouths of men. But it is called "the word of God," therefore, because a divine and not a human doctrine is handed down. But by means of this likeness we are endeavoring to see that Word of God, in whatever way we can, of whom it was said: "The Word was God," of whom it was said: "All things were made through him," of whom it was said: "The Word was made flesh" [*John* 1:1, 3, 14], of whom it was said: "The word of God on high is the fountain of wisdom" [*Ecclesiasticus* 1:5].

We must, therefore, come to that word of man, to the word of a living being endowed with reason, to the word of the image of God, not born of God but made by God; this word cannot be uttered in sound nor thought in the likeness of sound, such as must be done with the word of any language; it precedes all the signs by which it is signified, and is begotten by the knowledge which remains in the mind when this same knowledge is spoken inwardly, just as it is. For the sight of thought is very similar to the sight of knowledge. For, when it is spoken through a sound or through some bodily sign, it is not spoken just as it is, but as it can be seen or heard through the body. When, therefore, that which is in the knowledge is in the word, then it is a true word, and the truth which is expected from man, so that what is in the knowledge is also in the word, and what is not

in the knowledge is not in the word; it is here that we recognize "Yes, yes; no, no" [*Matthew* 5:37]. In this way the likeness of the image that was made approaches, insofar as it can, to the likeness of the image that was born, whereby God the Son is proclaimed as substantially like the Father in all things.

The following likeness in this enigma to the Word of God is also to be noted: just as it was said of that Word: "All things were made through him," where it is declared that God made all things through His only-begotten Word, so there are no works of man which are not first spoken in the heart, and, therefore, it is written: "The beginning of every work is the word" [cf. *Ecclesiasticus* 37:20]. But even here when the word is true, then it is the beginning of a good work. But the word is true, if it is begotten from the knowledge of working well, so that here too the admonition may be preserved: "Yes, yes; no, no." If it is "yes" in the knowledge by which one must live, it is also "yes" in the word by which the work is to be fulfilled; if it is "no" there, it is also "no" here. Otherwise, such a word will be a lie, not the truth, and consequently a sin and not a right work.

In the likeness of our word, there is also this likeness of the Word of God, that our word can exist and yet no work may follow it; but there can be no work unless the word precedes, just as the Word of God could be, even though no creature existed, but no creature could be, except through that Word through whom all things were made. Therefore, not God the Father, not the Holy Spirit, not the Trinity itself, but the Son alone, who is the Word of God, was made flesh, although the Trinity brought this about, in order that by our word following and imitating His example, we might live rightly, that is, that we might have no lie either in the contemplation or in the work of our word. But this perfection of this image is to be at some time in the future. In order to obtain it, the good master instructs us by the Christian faith and the doctrine of godliness, that "with face unveiled," from the veil of the Law, which is the shadow of things to come, "beholding the glory of the Lord," that is, looking as it were through a mirror, "we might be transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as through the Spirit of the Lord" [cf. *2 Corinthians* 3:18], according to our previous explanation of these words.

(21) When the image, therefore, has been renewed by this transformation, and so brought to perfection, then we shall be like to God, since we

shall see Him, not through a mirror, but just as He is, which the Apostle calls "face to face" [*1 Corinthians* 13:12]. But now in this mirror, in this enigma, in this likeness of whatever sort it may be, who can explain how great its unlikeness is? But I shall touch upon some points, as I am able, by which to perceive it.

Chapter 12

First, [consider] the knowledge from which our thought is formed so as to convey truth when we say what we know: of what sort is this knowledge, and how much of it can a man of even the most extraordinary skill and learning acquire? Suppose we pass over those things which come into the mind through the senses of the body, of which so many are different from what they seem that one who is excessively impressed by their apparent similarity to the truth believes himself to be sane, when he is insane. (From this the philosophical Academy[6] has prevailed to such an extent, that by doubting everything it has fallen into a much more wretched folly.) If, then, we pass over those things that come from the senses of the body into the mind, how much remains of things we know just as we know that we live? Here, at least, we have no fear of being accidentally deceived by some apparent likeness to the truth, because it is certain that even he who is deceived lives. Nor do we know this as we know those objects of sight, which are presented from without, where the eye may be deceived, as it is deceived when it sees the bent oar in the water, and when the navigators see the towers moving, and thousands of other things which are otherwise than they appear, for we do not even see this with the eye of the flesh.

It is an inner knowledge by which we know that we live, where not even the Academician can say: "Perhaps you are sleeping, and you do not know, and you see in dreams." For who does not know that things seen by those who are asleep are very similar to things seen by those who are awake. But he who is certain about the knowledge of his own life does not

[6] That is the "New Academy" of Arcesilaus and Carneades, as opposed to the "Old Academy" of Plato. This New Academy, which was a skeptical school, is referred to at DT 14.19.26. Its teachings are the subject of Augustine's criticisms in his "Against the Academics" (*Contra academicos*), which is his earliest surviving treatise. Augustine describes his brief attraction to Academic skepticism at *Confessions* 5.10.19.

say in it: "I know that I am awake," but "I know that I live"; whether he, therefore, sleeps, or whether he is awake, he lives. He cannot be deceived in his knowledge of this even by dreams, because to sleep and to see in dreams is characteristic of one who lives. Nor can the academician argue as follows against this knowledge: "Perhaps you are insane, and do not know it, because the things seen by the sane are very similar to those seen by the insane." But he who is insane lives. Nor does he make this retort to the academicians: "I know that I am not insane," but "I know that I live." He can never, therefore, be deceived nor lie who says that he knows that he lives. Let a thousand kinds of optical illusions be placed before one who says: "I know that I live"; he will fear none of them, since even he who is deceived, lives.[7]

If such things alone belong to human knowledge, then they are very few; unless it be that they are so multiplied in each kind that they are not only not few, but are even found to reach an infinite number. For he who says: "I know that I live," says that he knows one thing; if he were then to say: "I know that I know that I live," there are already two things, but that he knows these two, is to know a third thing; and so he can add a fourth and a fifth, and innumerable more, as long as he is able to do so. But because he cannot comprehend an innumerable number by adding one thing to another, or express a thing innumerable times, he comprehends this very fact and says with absolute certainty that this is both true and so innumerable that he cannot truly comprehend and express its infinite number.

Something similar can also be noted when the will is certain. For who would not regard: "Perhaps you are deceived," as an impudent reply to one who says: "I will to be happy?"[8] And if he were to say: "I know that I will this, and I know that I know this," then to these two he can also add a third, that he knows these two, and also a fourth, that he knows that he knows these two, and can likewise continue indefinitely. If someone were also to say: "I do not will to err," will it not be true that whether he errs or does not err, yet he does not will to err? Would it not be the

[7] This famous passage is very similar to the *si fallor, sum* passage in Augustine's *City of God*, at 11.26, except that here Augustine says "I know that I live," whereas in the other passage he says, "I know that I exist." Both passages have, of course, been often compared to Descartes' *cogito, ergo sum*. See the Introduction, under "Skepticism and the *cogito*."

[8] *beatus.*

height of impudence for anyone to say to this man: "Perhaps you are deceived," since no matter in what he may be deceived, he is certainly not deceived in not willing to be deceived? And if he says that he knows this, he adds as many known things as he pleases, and perceives it to be an infinite number. For he who says: "I do not will to be deceived, and I know that I do not will this, and I know that I know this," can also continue from here towards an indefinite number, however awkward this manner of expressing it may be. And other things are also found which can be used effectively against the academicians who contend that it is impossible for man to know anything.

But we have to set a limit somewhere, especially since this is not the purpose for which we have undertaken the present work. There are three books of ours on this subject,[9] which we wrote in the first period of our conversion, and anyone who can and will read, and understand what he reads, will certainly not be moved by the many arguments which they have thought up against the perception of the truth. For since there are two kinds of things which are known: one, the knowledge of those which the mind perceives through the senses of the body, the other of those which it perceives through itself, these philosophers have babbled many things against the senses of the body; but they have been utterly unable to cast doubt upon the most certain perceptions of things that are true, which the mind knows through itself, such as that which I have already mentioned: "I know that I live."

Far be it from us to doubt the truth of those things we have perceived through the senses of the body. For through them we have learned of the heavens and the earth, and those things in them which are known to us insofar as He, who has also created us and them, wanted them to become known to us. Far be it also from us to deny what we have learned from the testimony of others; otherwise, we would not know that there is an ocean; we would not know that there are lands and cities which the most celebrated fame commends; we would not know of the men and their works which we have learned in the reading of history; we would not know the news that is daily brought to us from everywhere, and is confirmed by evidence that is consistent and convincing; finally, we would not know in what places and from what persons we were born; because we have believed all of these things on the testimonies of others. But it is

[9] *Contra academicos* ("Against the Academicians"). See note 6.

most absurd to deny this, and we must confess that, not only the senses of our own bodies, but also those of other persons have added very much to our knowledge.

(22) The human mind, therefore, knows all these things which it has acquired through itself, through the senses of its body, and through the testimonies of others, and keeps them in the treasure-house of its memory; and from them a true word is begotten when we say what we know, but a word that is anterior to every sound and to every thought of sound. For then the word is most like the thing that is known, and from which its image is also begotten, since the sight of thought arises from the sight of knowledge. This is the word that belongs to no language, the true word about a true thing, having nothing from itself, but everything from that knowledge from which it is born. Nor does it make any difference when he who says what he knows has learned this, for sometimes he speaks as soon as he learns, provided only that it is a true word, that is, born from things that are known.

Chapter 13

Has God the Father, of whom the Word was born as God of God, has God the Father, then, in that Wisdom which He Himself is to Himself, learned something through the sense of His own body, and other things through Himself? Who would say such a thing as this? Who does not think of God not as a rational animal, but as above every rational mind, insofar as He can be thought of by them who prefer Him to all animals and to all souls, even though they see him through a mirror in an enigma and by conjectures, and not yet face to face, just as He is?

Or with regard to these things which God the Father knows, not through a body which He does not have, but through Himself, has He learned them elsewhere from someone? Or did He need messengers or witnesses in order to know them? Certainly not. For His own perfection suffices for Him to know all that He knows. He does indeed have messengers, that is, the angels, but not to announce to Him what He does not know, for there is nothing that He does not know; but their good consists in consulting His truth about their works; and that is why they are said to announce some things to Him, not that He Himself may learn from them, but that they themselves may learn from Him through His Word without any corporeal sound. They also announce what He has willed,

and are sent by Him to whom He has willed, hearing everything from Him through that Word of His, that is, finding in His truth what they are to do, as well as what, to whom, and when they are to announce it.

We also pray to Him, but yet we do not make Him aware of our necessities. "For your Father knows," His Word has said, "what is necessary for you before you ask him" [cf. *Matthew* 6:8]. Nor did He come to know them at any definite time, so as to know them now, but He knew beforehand, without any beginning, all future temporal things, and in them also, what, and when we should ask Him, and to whom He would listen or not listen, and on what subjects.

Yet He does not, therefore, know all His creatures, both spiritual and corporeal, because they are, but they, therefore, are because He knows them. For He was not ignorant of what He was going to create. He created, therefore, because He knew; He did not know because He created. He did not know them differently when they were created, than when they were to be created, for nothing has been added to His wisdom from them; it has remained the same as it was, while they came into existence as they should and when they should.[10] So it is also written in the Book of Ecclesiasticus: "All things were known to him before they were created, so also after they were perfected" [cf. *Ecclesiasticus* 23:29]. The word "so" is used here, meaning that they were not known to Him in a different way, but both "before they were created, and after they were perfected, so they were known to him."

This knowledge, therefore, is far unlike our knowledge. But the knowledge of God is also His wisdom, and His wisdom is His essence or substance itself. Because in the marvelous simplicity of that nature, it is not one thing to be wise, and another thing to be, but to be wise is the same as to be, as we have often mentioned in the preceding books. Our knowledge, on the contrary, can be lost and recovered in very many things, because in our case to be is not the same as to know, or to be wise, since we can be, even if we possess no knowledge or wisdom in those things which we have learned from elsewhere. Wherefore, just as our knowledge is unlike that knowledge of God, so our word, which is born from our knowledge, is also unlike that Word of God which is born from the essence

[10] The general principle here, that God's knowledge is the cause of what He knows, including what He foreknows, is accepted by many later Christian philosophers. It is, however, a troubling principle. Insofar as it makes God's knowledge the cause of what each human agent does, it *seems* to rule out the possibility of free human agency.

of the Father. But when I say "from the essence of the Father," it is just the same as saying, from the knowledge of the Father, or from the wisdom of the Father, or, to be more explicit, from the Father who is knowledge, from the Father who is wisdom.

Chapter 14

(23) The Word, therefore, the only-begotten Son of God the Father, like and equal in all things to the Father, God of God, light of light, wisdom of wisdom, essence of essence: He is wholly the same as the Father, and yet is not the Father, because this is the Son, and that is the Father. And, therefore, He knows all that the Father knows; but for Him to know is of the Father, as also to be is of the Father. For there to know and to be is one. And, consequently, to the Father, as to be is not of the Son, so neither is to know. And, therefore, the Father, as though uttering Himself, begot the Word, equal in all things to Himself. For He would not have uttered Himself completely and perfectly, if there were anything less or more in His Word than in Himself. Here above all do we recognize "Yes, yes; no, no." And, therefore, this Word is truly the Truth, since whatever is in that knowledge from which it was born is also in the Word; but that which is not in the knowledge is not in the Word. Therefore, this Word can never have anything false, because He is just as unchangeable as He is from whom He is.

"For the Son can do nothing of Himself, but only what he sees the Father doing" [*John* 5:19]. Of His own power He cannot do this, nor is this weakness, but the strength by which the truth cannot be false. God the Father, therefore, knows all things in Himself, and He knows all things in His Son, but in Himself as Himself, and in the Son as His Word, the Word which is spoken concerning all those things which are in Himself. In like manner the Son also knows all things, namely, in Himself, as those which were born from those which the Father knows in Himself, but in the Father, as those from which were born, what the born, what the Son Himself knows in Himself. The Father and the Son, therefore, know each other mutually, but the former by begetting, the latter by being born. And all the things that are in their knowledge, in their wisdom, in their essence, each of them sees simultaneously, not partly or singly, as though His gaze passed alternately from one object to another, from there to here, and again from one side to another, so that He cannot see some things if

He sees other things, but, as I said, He sees all things simultaneously, and nothing is there which He does not always see.

(24) But that word of ours, which has neither sound nor thought of sound, is the word of that thing which we inwardly speak by seeing it, and, therefore, it belongs to no language; hence, in this enigma there is a likeness, be it what it may, to that Word of God who is also God, since it is also so born from our knowledge as that Word was also born from the knowledge of the Father. Such, then, is our word in which we indeed find a likeness, be it what it may, to that Word, but, insofar as we are able, we shall point out how great an unlikeness there also is, and let us not be sluggish in perceiving this.

Chapter 15

Is our word born from our knowledge alone? Do we not also say many things which we do not know? We are not in doubt when we say them, but we judge them to be true; and if perhaps they are true, then they are true in the things themselves of which we speak and not in our word, because a word is only true if it is born from the thing which one knows. In this way, therefore, our word is false, not when we lie, but when we are deceived. But when we doubt, it is not yet the word about the thing of which we doubt, but the word about the doubt itself. For although we do not know whether the thing is true about which we doubt, yet we know that we doubt, and, therefore, when we say this, it is a true word, since we are saying what we know. What, then, about the possibility of also telling a lie? When we do this, then indeed we willingly and knowingly have a false word, and in this case the true word is that we lie, for we know this. And when we confess that we have lied, we speak the truth, for we are saying what we know, and we know that we have lied.

That Word, however, which is God and more powerful than ourselves, cannot do this. "For he can do nothing, but only what he sees the Father doing." And of Himself He does not speak, but of that Father is everything that He speaks, since the Father speaks it in a unique way; and the great power of that Word is that He cannot lie, because in Him there cannot be "Yes and no" [*2 Corinthians* 1:19], but "Yes, yes; no, no." For that is not even to be called a word if it is not true. If it be so, then I willingly agree. What then? When our word is true and, therefore, is rightly called a word, it can be called sight of sight, or knowledge of knowledge. Can it

also be called essence of essence, as that Word of God is especially called, and is to be especially called? Why so? For with us to be is not the same as to know. For we know many things which live in some manner through our memory, and also die in some manner through forgetfulness, and, therefore, when they are no longer in our knowledge, yet we are; and when our knowledge has slipped from us and perished out of our mind, yet we live.

(25) Even with regard to these things which are so known that they can never fall away, since they are present and belong to the nature of the mind itself, such as the knowledge that we live – for this remains as long as the mind remains, and since the mind always remains, so too this knowledge always remains – even with regard to these things, therefore, and other similar things that are found, in which the image of God is rather to be beheld, though they are always known, yet since they are not also always thought, it is difficult to ascertain in what way they can be called an eternal word, since our word is spoken in our thought.

It is eternal to the mind to live, it is eternal to know that it lives. But yet it is not eternal to think of its life, or to think of the knowledge of its life, since it does not think of it when it begins to think now of this and now of that thing, although it does not cease to know it. Hence, if there can be an eternal knowledge in the mind, and yet the thought of this same knowledge cannot be eternal, and our true inner word can only be spoken in our thought, then it follows that God alone may be understood to have an eternal Word, co-eternal with Himself. Unless perhaps we are to say that the mere possibility of thought – for what is known, even when it is not thought, can yet be truly thought – is a word as perpetual as knowledge itself is perpetual. But how is that a word which has not yet been formed in the gaze of thought? How will it be like the knowledge from which it is born if it does not even have its form, and, therefore, is already being called a word because it can have it? For this is the same as saying that it must, therefore, be already called "a word" because it can be a word.

What is that which can be a word, and, therefore, is already worthy of the name of a word? What, I say, is this word, formable and not yet formed, except something of our own mind which we cast this way and that by a kind of revolving motion, according as we think now of this and now of that thing, just as they are found, or as they occur to our mind? And it then becomes a true word when that which we cast, as I have said,

by a revolving motion, arrives at that which we know, and is formed by it by taking its perfect likeness, so that as any thing is known, so it is also thought, so it is spoken in the heart, that is, without sound, without the thought of sound, such as certainly belongs to some language.

Therefore, even if we should concede, in order that we may not appear to be engaged in a controversy about words, that something of our own mind is already to be called a word which can be formed from our knowledge even before it is formed, because it is, so to say, already formable, who does not see how great its unlikeness is here to that Word of God, who is so in the form of God that He was not previously formable before He was formed, nor can He ever be formless, but that He is a simple form, and simply equal to Him from whom He is, and to whom He is in a marvelous way co-eternal?

Chapter 16

Thus He is so called "the Word of God" as not to be called "the thought of God," lest it be believed that there is, as it were, something revolving in God that now receives and now recovers a form in order to be a word, and that it can lose this form, and in some manner revolve formlessly. That distinguished master of speech knew both the meaning of words and the power of thought, who said in a poem: "He revolves within himself the changing fortunes of war,"[11] that is, he thinks. This Son of God, therefore, is not called the thought of God, but the Word of God. For when our thought arrives at that which we know and is formed therefrom, it is our true word. Hence, the Word of God ought to be understood without any thought on the part of God, in order that it may be understood to be a simple form, having nothing formable that can also be unformed. The Sacred Scriptures, it is true, also speak about the thoughts of God, but do so according to that manner of speech in which they also speak about the forgetfulness of God, and certainly such expressions do not apply in the strict sense to God.

(26) Accordingly, since there is now so great an unlikeness in this enigma both to God and to the Son of God, in which, however, some likeness has been found, we must also confess that even when "we shall be like to him," when "we shall see him just as he is" [*1 John* 3:2] (certainly

[11] Vergil, *Aeneid*, Book 10, vv. 159–60.

he who spoke thus was undoubtedly aware of the unlikeness that now exists), not even then shall we be equal to that nature, for a nature that is made is always less than He who made it. And then indeed our word will not be false, because we shall neither lie nor be deceived; perhaps, too, our thoughts will not be revolving, going from one thing to another and returning, but we shall see all our knowledge in a single glance; yet when this shall also take place, if indeed it does take place, and the creature that was formable shall be formed so that nothing shall be wanting to that form at which it ought to arrive, yet it will not be made equal to that simplicity, where nothing formable is either formed or reformed, but where there is only form; and since it is neither unformed nor formed, it itself is an eternal and unchangeable substance.

Chapter 17

(27) We have spoken sufficiently about the Father and the Son, insofar as we have been able to see through this mirror and in this enigma. Now we are to speak about the Holy Spirit, insofar as God the Giver shall permit. According to the Sacred Scriptures, this Holy Spirit is neither the Spirit of the Father alone, nor of the Son alone, but the Spirit of both, and, therefore, He insinuates to us the common love by which the Father and the Son mutually love each other. But in order to exercise us, the divine word has caused us to inquire with greater zeal, not into those things that lie openly at hand, but into those that are to be searched out in the depths, and brought to light from the depths.

The Scripture, therefore, has not said that the Holy Spirit is love; had it done so, it would have removed no small part of this problem; but it said: "God is love" [*1 John* 4:16], so that its meaning is uncertain, and, hence, we must inquire whether God the Father is love, or God the Son, or God the Holy Spirit, or God the Trinity itself. For it is our contention that God is called love for this reason, that love itself is a substance worthy of the name of God, and not merely because it is a gift of God, such as where it is said to God: "For thou art my patience" [cf. *Psalm* 71:5]; for it is not, therefore, said that the substance of God is our patience, but that it comes to us from Him, as it is read elsewhere: "For from him is my patience" [cf. *Psalm* 62:5]. The speech itself of the Scriptures easily refutes any other interpretation. For such a sentence as "Thou art my patience" is said in the same sense as: "Thou, O Lord, art my hope" [cf. *Psalm* 91:9],

and "My God, my mercy" [*Psalm* 59:17], and many similar texts. But it was not said: "O Lord, my love," or "Thou art my love," or "God, my love"; but it was said: "God is love" in the same sense as it was said: "God is spirit" [*John* 4:24]. Let him who cannot grasp this distinction ask the Lord for understanding, not an explanation from us, for we cannot say anything more clearly.

(28) Therefore, "God is love"; but the question that arises here is, whether it is the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit, or the Trinity itself, because it, too, is not three gods but one God. But, as I have already explained in this book, the Trinity that God is, is not to be conceived according to those three things which we pointed out in the trinity of our mind, so that the Father is, as it were, the memory of all three, and the Son the understanding of all three, and the Holy Spirit the love of all three, just as though the Father does not understand nor love for Himself, but that the Son understands for Him, and the Holy Spirit loves for Him, but that He Himself only remembers for Himself and for them; and as though the Son neither remembers nor loves for Himself, but that the Father remembers for Him, and the Holy Spirit loves for Him, but that He Himself only understands for Himself and for them; and as though the Holy Spirit likewise neither remembers nor understands for Himself, but that the Father remembers for Him and the Son understands for Him, but that He Himself only loves for Himself and for them.

We should rather so conceive this, that all together possess and each one possesses all three of these in their own nature, that these things do not differ in them, as memory in us is one thing, understanding another, and dilection or love another, but that we should so conceive these three as some one thing which all have, as wisdom itself, and which is so retained in the nature of each one, as that He who has it, is that which He has, as being an unchangeable and simple substance. If, then, these things are understood, and it has become clear to us that they are true, insofar as it is granted us to see and to conjecture in such great subjects, I do not know why, as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are called wisdom, and all together are not three wisdoms but one wisdom, so the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit should not be called love, and all together one love. For so is the Father God, the Son God, and the Holy Spirit God, and all together are one God.

(29) Yet it is not without reason that in this Trinity only the Son is called the Word of God, and that only the Holy Spirit is the Gift of

God, and that only He, of whom the Son was begotten, and from whom the Holy Spirit principally proceeds, is God the Father. I have added "principally," therefore, because the Holy Spirit is also found to proceed from the Son. But the Father also gave this to Him, not as though He already existed and did not yet have it, but whatever He gave to the only-begotten Word, He gave by begetting Him. He so begot Him, therefore, that the common Gift should also proceed from Him, and that the Holy Spirit should be the Spirit of both. This distinction in the inseparable Trinity, therefore, is not to be touched upon in passing, but is to be carefully considered. For it was brought out by means of it, that the Word of God should be specially called also the wisdom of God, even though the Father and the Holy Spirit are wisdom. If, then, any one of these three is to be specially called love, what more fitting than that this should be the Holy Spirit? In the sense, that is, that in that simple and highest nature, substance is not one thing, and love another thing, but that substance itself is love, and that love itself is substance, whether in the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit, and yet that the Holy Spirit is especially called "love."

(30) Thus at times all the sayings of the ancient covenant of the Sacred Scriptures are designated together by the name "Law." For the Apostle cites the testimony from the Prophet Isaiah, where he says: "In other tongues and with other lips I will speak to this people," and yet he had prefaced this by saying: "In the Law it is written" [*Isaiah* 28:11, and *1 Corinthians* 14:21]. And the Lord Himself says: "In their Law it is written, 'They have hated me without cause'" [cf. *John* 15:25]; although this is read in the Psalm [cf. *Psalm* 35:19]. At times, however, the Law is specially called that which was given through Moses, as when it is said: "The Law and the Prophets until John" [*Matthew* 11:13], and "On these two commandments depend the whole Law and the Prophets" [*Matthew* 22:40]. Here certainly that given from Mt. Sinai has been specially designated as the Law.

The Psalms are also signified by the name of Prophets, and yet the Savior Himself says in another place: "All these things must be fulfilled that are written in the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms concerning me" [cf. *Luke* 24:44]. Here, on the contrary, He meant that the name of Prophets is to be understood as not including the Psalms. Therefore, when the Law is spoken of in the universal sense, it includes both the Prophets and the Psalms, but it is also spoken of in the special sense as

that which was given through Moses. Similarly the Prophets are so called in common with the Psalms; they are also so called specially as exclusive of the Psalms. And it could be shown from many other examples that many names of things are both applied universally, and also used specially for certain things, except that a prolonged discussion on a subject so obvious is to be avoided. But I have mentioned this, therefore, that no one might think that we are not justified in giving the name of love to the Holy Spirit, because God the Father and God the Son can also be called "love."

(31) Hence, as only the Word of God is properly called by the name "Wisdom," although in the universal sense both the Holy Spirit and the Father Himself are wisdom, so the Holy Spirit is properly called by the name of love, although in the universal sense both the Father and the Son are love. But the Word of God, that is, the only-begotten Son has been plainly called "the wisdom of God" by the mouth of the Apostle where he says: "Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God" [*1 Corinthians* 1:24]. But we find that the Holy Spirit has been called love, if we carefully examine a statement of John the Apostle. For, when he had said: "Beloved, let us love one another because love is of God," he immediately added: "And everyone who loves is born of God, and knows God. He who does not love, does not know God, for God is love." He here revealed that God is called that love which he says: "is of God." The God of God, therefore, is love.

Because the Son is born of God the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from God the Father, the question is rightly asked, of which of them should we rather take it to be said here, that God is love? For the Father alone is God in such a way that He is not of God; and, therefore, the love, which is God in such a way that it is of God, is either the Son or the Holy Spirit. But in the following verses after speaking of the love of God, not that by which we love Him, but that "by which he first loved us, and sent his Son as a propitiation for our sins"; and, hence, exhorts us to love one another, that so God might abide in us, then, because he had said in unmistakable terms that God is love, he wanted to speak more plainly on this subject at once: "In this," he said, "we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit." Therefore, the Holy Spirit, of whom He has given us, causes us to remain in God, and God in us. But love does this. He is, therefore, the God who is love.

Finally, a little later, when he had repeated the identical expression and said: "God is love," he immediately added: "He who abides in love abides

in God, and God in him"; whence he had said above: "In this we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit." The latter is, therefore, meant where it is read: "God is love." When God the Holy Spirit, therefore, who proceeds from God, has been given to man, He inflames him with the love for God and his neighbor, and He Himself is love. For man does not have whence to love God, except from God. Wherefore a little later he says: "Let us love him, because he first loved us" [cf. *1 John* 4:7–19]. The Apostle Paul also says: "The charity of God is poured in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, who has been given to us" [*Romans* 5:5].

Chapter 18

(32) Nothing is more excellent than this gift of God. It is this alone which divides the children of the eternal kingdom from the children of eternal perdition. Other gifts are also bestowed by the Holy Spirit, but without charity they profit nothing. Unless the Holy Spirit, therefore, imparts to everyone so much as to make him a lover of God and of his neighbor, then he is not transferred from the left to the right side. The Spirit is specially called the Gift for no other reason except love; and he who does not have it, even if he should speak with the tongues of men and angels, is as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal; and if he should have prophecy and know all mysteries and all knowledge, and if he should have all faith so as to remove mountains, it is nothing; and if he should distribute all his goods, and if he should deliver his body to be burned, it profits him nothing [cf. *1 Corinthians* 13:1–3]. How great, then, is that good without which such great goods lead no one to eternal life.

On the contrary, if one does not speak with tongues, does not have prophecy, does not know all the mysteries and all knowledge, does not distribute all his goods to the poor, either because he has none to distribute, or is prevented by some necessity, and does not deliver his body to be burned, if there is no occasion for such a suffering, and yet does have love or charity (for they are two names of one thing), then it alone leads to the kingdom, so that nothing except love makes faith itself useful. For there can indeed be faith without love, but it likewise profits nothing. And, therefore, the Apostle Paul also says: "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision is of any avail, nor uncircumcision, but faith which works through charity" [*Galatians* 5:6], thus distinguishing it from the faith by

which the devils also believe and tremble [*James* 2:19]. Love, then, which is from God and is God, is properly the Holy Spirit, through whom the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, through which the whole Trinity dwells in us. For this reason the Holy Spirit, since He is God, is also most rightly called the Gift of God [*Acts* 8:20]. What else is to be understood by the Gift in the strict sense except charity which leads to God, and without which any other gift, no matter which, does not lead to God?

Chapter 19

(33) Or is it also necessary to prove that the Holy Spirit is called the Gift of God in the Sacred Scriptures? If this is likewise expected, then in the Gospel according to John we have the words of our Lord Jesus Christ who says: "If anyone thirst, let him come to me and drink. He who believes in me, as the Scripture says, 'Out of his belly shall flow living waters.'" Then the Apostle immediately added: "He said this, however, of the Spirit whom they who believe in him were about to receive" [cf. *John* 7:37–39]. Wherefore the Apostle Paul also says: "And we have all drunk the one Spirit" [cf. *1 Corinthians* 12:13].

But the question raised here is, whether this water has been called the Gift of God which is the Holy Spirit. But just as we find here that this water is the Holy Spirit, so we find this water called the Gift of God in another place of the same Gospel. For when the same Lord spoke to the Samaritan woman at the well, saying: "Give me to drink," and she had replied that the Jews would not associate with the Samaritans, Jesus answered and said to her: "If thou didst know the gift of God, and who it is who says to thee, 'Give me to drink', thou perhaps would have asked of him, and he would have given to thee living water. The woman says to him, 'Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with and the well is deep. Whence then hast thou living water?' Jesus answered and said to her, 'Everyone who drinks of this water, will thirst again. He, however, who drinks of the water that I will give him shall never thirst; but the water that I will give him shall become in him a fountain of water, springing up unto life everlasting'" [*John* 4:7–14].

Because this living water, therefore, as the Evangelist explained, is the Holy Spirit, without doubt this Spirit is the Gift of God, of whom the Lord here says: "If thou didst know the gift of God, and who it is who

says to thee, 'Give me to drink,' thou perhaps would have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water." For what he refers to there as "Out of his belly shall flow living waters," He speaks of in this place as "a fountain of water, springing up unto life everlasting."

(34) Paul the Apostle also says: "To each one of us grace is given according to the measure of Christ's bestowal"; and to show that this bestowal of Christ was the Holy Spirit, he went on to say: "Wherefore it says, 'He ascends on high, he led captivity captive; he gave gifts to me'" [cf. *Ephesians* 4:7–8]. But the best-known instance of all is when the Lord Jesus, after rising from the dead and returning to heaven, gave the Holy Spirit, by whom they who had believed were filled, and spoke in the languages of all nations. And do not argue that it says "gifts," instead of "gift." Paul has cited this text from a Psalm, but in that Psalm we read as follows: "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts in men" [cf. *Psalm* 68:18]. For so it is found in many codices, particularly the Greek, and we have so translated it from the Hebrew. The Apostle, therefore, just as the Prophet said "gifts" and not "gift." But whereas the Prophet had said: "Thou hast received gifts in men," the Apostle preferred to say: "He gave gifts to men," so that the fullest sense might be rendered from both utterances, one prophetic and the other apostolic, because both are supported by the authority of the Divine Word.

Both are true, because He gave to men and also received in men. He gave to men, as the head to His members, and the self-same One received them in men, especially in His own members; and because they were His members He exclaimed from heaven: "Saul, Saul, why dost thou persecute me?" [*Acts* 9:4] And of those who were His members He says: "When you did it for one of my least brethren, you did it for me" [cf. *Matthew* 25:40]. Christ Himself, therefore, both gave from heaven and received on earth. And furthermore, both of them, the Prophet and the Apostle, spoke of "gifts" for this reason, because many gifts, which are proper to each one, are divided in common among all the members of Christ by the Gift which is the Holy Spirit. For not everyone has all of them, but some have these and others those, although all have the Gift Himself by whom the things proper to each one are divided, namely, the Holy Spirit.

Elsewhere, after mentioning many of these gifts, he said: "But all these things one and the same Spirit works, dividing what is proper to each one

according as he will" [cf. *1 Corinthians* 12:11]. And this word is also found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is written: "God bearing them witness by signs and wonders and manifold powers, and by impartings of the Holy Spirit" [*Hebrews* 2:4]. And when he had said here: "He ascended on high, he led captivity captive, he gave gifts to men," he continued: "Now this 'he ascended,' what does it mean, except that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He who descends is the same also who ascends above all the heavens, that he might fill all things. And he himself gave some men indeed as apostles, and some as prophets, others again as evangelists, and others as pastors and teachers" [cf. *Ephesians* 4:8–11]. Behold the reason why they are called gifts, because, as he says elsewhere: "Are all apostles? Are all prophets?" etc. [*1 Corinthians* 12:29]. But he added here: "In order to perfect the saints for a work of the ministry, for building up the body of Christ" [cf. *Ephesians* 4:12].

This is the house which, as the Psalm sings, is built after the captivity [cf. *Psalm* 126:1], since the house of Christ, called the Church, is built of those rescued from the devil who had held them captive. But He Himself, who conquered the devil, has led this captivity captive. And that the devil might not draw into eternal perdition with himself, those who would one day be members of His sacred Head, Christ bound him first by the chains of justice, and then by those of power. Hence, the devil himself has been called the captivity which He, who ascended on high, led captive, and gave gifts to men, or received them in men.

(35) When the Apostle Peter spoke to the Jews of Christ, as we read in that canonical book in which the Acts of the Apostles are recorded, their hearts were moved; they said to him: "Brethren, what then shall we do. Show us." He said to them: "Do penance, and let everyone of you be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of your sins, and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" [cf. *Acts* 2:37–38]. Similarly, it is read in the same book that Simon the magician wanted to give money to the Apostles, in order that he might receive from them the power by which the Holy Spirit would be given through the imposition of his hands. And the same Peter said to him: "Let thy money be with thee for thy perdition, because thou hast thought to possess the gift of God through money" [cf. *Acts* 8:20]. And in another passage of the same book, while he was speaking to Cornelius and to those who were with him, announcing and preaching Christ, the Scripture says: "While Peter was still speaking these words, the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard the

word, and the faithful of the circumcision, who had come with Peter, were amazed, because on the Gentiles also the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured forth. For they heard them speaking in tongues, and magnifying God" [cf. *Acts* 10:44–46].

Peter later gave an account of this incident to the brethren in Jerusalem, who were disturbed when they heard about the Baptism of the uncircumcised, upon whom the Holy Spirit, as though to remove the knot of this problem, had descended even before they were baptized; after some other things he said: "But when I began to speak to them, the Holy Spirit fell upon them, as also upon us in the beginning. And I remembered the word of the Lord, as he said, 'That John indeed baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit.' Therefore if God gave equal grace to them, as he gave to us who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I should be able to prohibit God from giving to them the Holy Spirit" [cf. *Acts* 11:15–17]. And there are many other testimonies of the Scriptures, which unanimously attest that the Gift of God is the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as He is given to those who love God through Him. But it would take too long to gather all of them; and what is sufficient for them for whom these things that we have said are not sufficient?

(36) Since they already see that the Holy Spirit has been called the Gift of God, consequently, we must warn them that, when they hear "the gift of the Holy Spirit," to recognize that same manner of speech, according to which it was also said "in the despoiling of the body of the flesh" [cf. *Colossians* 2:11]. For just as the body of the flesh is nothing else than the flesh, so the Gift of the Holy Spirit is nothing else than the Holy Spirit. He is, therefore, the Gift of God, inasmuch as He is given to those to whom He is given. But in Himself, He is God, even though He is given to no one, because He was God, co-eternal with the Father and the Son even before He was given to anyone. Nor because they give and He is given is He, therefore, less than they, for He is so given as the Gift of God that He also gives Himself as God. For it is impossible to say of Him that He is not the master of His own power, of whom it was said: "The Spirit breathes where he will" [cf. *John* 3:8]. And in the writings of the Apostle which I have mentioned above: "And one and the same Spirit works, dividing what is proper to each one according as he will." There is here no subordination of the Gift and no domination of the Givers, but the concord between the Gift and the Givers.

(37) Wherefore, if the Sacred Scripture proclaims: “God is love,” as also that love is of God, and acts in us that we may remain in God and He in us, and we know this, because He has given us of His Spirit, then the Spirit Himself is the God who is love. Furthermore, if among the gifts of God none is greater than love, and there is no greater gift of God than the Holy Spirit, what more logical than that He Himself should be love, who is called both God and of God? And if the love whereby the Father loves the Son, and the Son the Father, reveals in an ineffable manner the union between both, what more fitting than that He, who is the Spirit, common to both, should be properly called love?

It is sounder to believe, or to understand, that the Holy Spirit alone is not love in that Trinity, but yet not without reason is He specially called love, on account of those things which have been said. Just as in that Trinity He alone is not spirit, and He alone is not holy, because the Father is spirit and the Son is spirit, and the Father is holy and the Son is holy, which piety does not doubt, and yet not without reason is He specially called the Holy Spirit. For since He is common to both, He is properly called that which both are called in common. Otherwise, if in that Trinity the Holy Spirit alone is love, then indeed even the Son is found to be the Son, not of the Father alone, but of the Holy Spirit as well.

The only-begotten Son of God the Father! Such is the name by which He is called, and which is read in innumerable places; and yet what the Apostle says of God the Father also remains true: “Who has rescued us from the power of darkness, and transferred us into the kingdom of the Son of his love” [cf. *Colossians* 1:13]. He did not say “of his Son,” though if he had said it, he would have most truly said it, just as because he often said it, he most truly said it, but he said “of the Son of his love.” Therefore, He is also the Son of the Holy Spirit if no one in that Trinity is the love of God except the Holy Spirit. And if this is most absurd, it remains that there the Holy Spirit alone is not love, but that He is properly so called on account of those things that I have sufficiently explained; but when He is called “the Son of his love,” nothing else is to be understood than “of his beloved Son,” or finally “of the Son of his substance.” For the love of the Father, which is in that ineffably simple nature, is nothing else than His own nature and substance itself, as we have already frequently said, and it does not annoy us to repeat it frequently. And, therefore, the Son of His love is none other than He who was born of His substance.

Chapter 20

(38) We must then smile at the logic of Eunomius,[12] from whom the Eunomian heretics derive their name. He could not understand, nor did he wish to believe, that the only-begotten Word of God, through whom all things have been made, was the Son of God by nature, that is, begotten from the substance of the Father; therefore, he said that He was not the Son of His nature, or substance, or essence, but the Son of the will of God; he would accordingly claim that the will, by which He begot the Son, was accidental to God, and, therefore, similar to what takes place in us, because we sometimes will something that we did not will previously, just as though our nature is not understood to be changeable by this very fact, and far be it from us to believe that it is so in God.

The only reason why it was written: "Many thoughts are in the heart of man, but the counsel of the Lord remains forever" [cf. *Proverbs* 19:21], was that we might understand or believe that as God is eternal, so His counsel is eternal, and, therefore, as unchangeable as He Himself is. But what is said of the thoughts can also be most truly said of the wills: "Many wills are in the heart of man, but the will of the Lord remains forever." But in order that they might not have to call the only-begotten Word the Son of the counsel or of the will of God, some said that the same Word was the counsel or will of the Father. As far as I can judge, however, it is better to call Him counsel of counsel and will of will, just as He is called substance of substance and wisdom of wisdom, lest we be guilty of that absurd opinion, which we have already refuted, that the Son is said to make the Father wise or willing if the Father does not have counsel or will in His own substance.

A certain man gave indeed a clever answer to a heretic who had asked him very cunningly, whether God begot the Son willingly or unwillingly, so that if he replied "unwillingly," then the most absurd consequence would follow, that God was miserable; but if "willingly," then he would immediately draw the conclusion that he had intended, just as though such a reason were invincible, that the Word is the Son, not of the nature, but of the will. But this particular man, being very alert, asked him in turn whether God the Father was God willingly or unwillingly, so that if he answered "unwillingly," then it would again follow that God was miserable, and it is a great folly to believe this of God; but that if he said "willingly," then he would reply to him: "Therefore even He is God by

[12] An extreme Arian, who seems to have denied that the Son is like the Father.

His will and not by His nature." What else remained for this heretic save but to keep silent, and to see himself held fast by an unbreakable chain through his own question? But if the will of God is also to be specially attributed to any Person in the Trinity, then this name, just as love, belongs more appropriately to the Holy Spirit. For what else is love than will?

(39) I see that I have reasoned about the Holy Spirit in this book according to the Sacred Scriptures; this suffices for the faithful who already know that the Holy Spirit is God, that He is not of another substance, nor less than the Father and the Son – in the preceding books we have already taught that these statements are true according to these same Scriptures. By making use also of the creature which God has made, insofar as we could, we have warned those, who demand the reason concerning such things, that they should behold the invisible things of Him through those that were made [cf. *Romans* 1:20], especially through that rational or intellectual creature which was made to the image of God; through which, as through a mirror, they would behold, insofar as they would be able, if indeed they would be able, that God who is Trinity in our memory, understanding, and will.

But anyone who intelligently perceives that these three things are by nature divinely established in his own mind, and how great a thing is in it, where even an eternal and unchangeable nature can be recalled, beheld, and desired – remembers it by memory, contemplates it by his understanding, and embraces it by his love; certainly such a one discovers the image of that highest Trinity. Man ought to direct all that lives in him to remember, to see, and to love this highest Trinity, in order that he may recall it, contemplate it, and find his delight in it. But lest anyone should so compare this image, made by this same Trinity and changed for the worse by his own fault, as to think it similar to this same Trinity in every respect, I have warned him, insofar as I deemed sufficient, that he should rather behold in this likeness, of whatever sort it may be, the great unlikeness that there also is.

Chapter 21

(40) I have indeed exerted myself as much as I could to make God the Father and God the Son known to us, that is, God the Begetter, who in some way has uttered everything that He has in His substance in His Word, co-eternal with Himself, and His Word, God Himself, who likewise has

nothing more nor less in His substance than what was in Him who did not beget the Word falsely but truly, not for the purpose of now seeing them face to face, but rather of seeing them through this likeness in an enigma [*1 Corinthians* 13:12], in the memory and understanding of our own mind, by means of conjectures however tenuous they might be, attributing to the memory everything that we know, even if we do not think of it, and to the understanding the formation of thought by its own special type of thinking.

We usually say that we understand what we have found to be true by thinking of it, and this indeed we again leave in our memory. But that is a more profound depth of our memory, where we also find those contents which we think of for the first time, and where the inner word is begotten which does not belong to the language of any nation, as it were, knowledge of knowledge, vision of vision, and understanding of understanding, for the understanding, which appears in thought, comes from the understanding which already existed in the memory but was latent there, although even thought itself, unless it had some memory of its own, would not return to those things which it had left in the memory when it thought of other things.

(41) With regard to the Holy Spirit, I pointed out that nothing in this enigma would seem to be like Him except our will, or love, or charity which is a stronger will. For our will, which belongs to us by nature, experiences various emotions, according to whether the things which are adjacent to it or which it encounters either entice or repel us. What, then, follows from this? Are we going to say that our will, when it is right, does not know what it should desire, what it should avoid? But if it does know, then doubtless it possesses its own kind of knowledge which cannot be there without memory and understanding.

Or should we listen to anyone who says that love, which does not act perversely, does not know what to do? As there is understanding, so, therefore, there is also love in that principal memory in which we find prepared and stored away that which we can reach in thought; for we also find these two there when we find by thinking that we understand and love something; and they were there even when we were not thinking of them. And just as there is memory, so there is also love for this understanding which is formed by thought; and we utter this true word within us without the language of any people when we say what we know; for the gaze of thought does not return to anything except by remembering, and does

not care to return except by loving; thus love, which unites as a parent with its offspring, the vision brought about in the memory with the vision formed from it in thought, would not know what it should rightly love if it did not have the knowledge of desiring, which cannot be there without memory and understanding.

Chapter 22

(42) But when these three are in one person, such as man is, anyone could say to us: these three, memory, understanding, and love are mine, not their own; they do what they do not for themselves, but for me, nay rather, I do it through them. For I remember by memory, understand by understanding, and love by love; and when I turn the eye of thought to my memory and so say in my heart what I know, and a true word is begotten from my knowledge, then both are mine, namely, the knowledge and the word. For I know, and I say in my heart what I know. And when I find in my memory by means of thought that I already understand something, that I already love something – this understanding and this love were already there even before I thought of it – I find my understanding and my love in my memory, whereby I understand and I love, not these things themselves. Similarly, when thought remembers itself and wills to return to those things which it has left in the memory, and to contemplate and to utter inwardly what it once understood, it is by my memory that it remembers, and by my will that it wills, not by their own. My love itself, too, when it remembers and understands what it ought to desire and what it ought to avoid, remembers by my memory, not by its own, and it understands by my understanding, not by its own, whatever it intelligently loves. This can be expressed briefly: I, by all these three things, remember, I understand, I love, I, who am neither my memory, nor my understanding, nor my love, but I have these.

Such things could be said, therefore, by one person who has these three and is not himself these three. But in the simplicity of that highest nature, which God is, although there is one God, yet there are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Chapter 23

(43) A thing, therefore, which is a trinity is not the same as an image of a trinity in another thing; on account of which image that, too, in which

these three are, is at the same time called an "image"; just as the panel and the picture painted on it are together called an image, but on account of the picture painted on it, the panel is at the same time called an image. On the contrary, the inseparability in that highest Trinity, which incomparably surpasses all things, is so great that although a trinity of men cannot be called one man, yet that Trinity is called and is one God, nor is that Trinity in one God, but it is the one God. Nor again, as this image, which the man is who has these three, is one person, so is that Trinity one Person, but there are three Persons, the Father of the Son, the Son of the Father, and the Spirit of both the Father and the Son.

Although the memory of man, and particularly that which beasts do not have, namely, that in which intelligible things are so contained that they do not come into it through the senses of the body, has, in proportion to its own small measure in this image of the Trinity, a likeness, incomparably unequal, of course, but yet a likeness of whatever kind it may be to the Father; and similarly, although the understanding of man, which is formed from the memory by the attention of thought, when that which is known is spoken – it is a word of the heart and belongs to no language – has in its great unlikeness some likeness to the Son; and although the love of man which proceeds from knowledge and combines the memory and the understanding, as though common to the parent and the offspring – whence it is understood to be neither the parent nor the offspring – has in this image some likeness, although very unequal, to the Holy Spirit, yet we do not find that, as in this image of the Trinity, these three are not the one man, but belong to the one man, so in the highest Trinity itself, whose image this is, are those three of one God, but they are the one God, and there are three Persons, not one.

And what is indeed wonderfully ineffable, or ineffably wonderful, is that, although this image of the Trinity is one person, while there are three Persons in the highest Trinity itself, yet this Trinity of three Persons is more inseparable than that trinity of one person. For this Trinity in the nature of the divinity, or it may be better to call it "the Godhead," is that which it is, is mutually unchangeable and always equal; there never was a time when it was not, nor when it was otherwise, neither will there ever be a time when it will not be, nor when it will be otherwise.

These three things, however, which are in the unequal image, are now separated from one another in this life, not indeed in place, since they are not bodies, but by their magnitudes. For, although no bulk is present

there, we do not, therefore, fail to see that memory is greater in one than understanding, while in another it is just the opposite; in another these two are surpassed by the greatness of love, whether they themselves are equal to each other or whether they are not. And so each two are surpassed by each one, and each one by each two, and each one by each one, and the lesser by the greater. And when they shall be cured of every infirmity and shall be mutually equal, even then that thing, which through grace shall not be changed, will not be made equal to the thing that is unchangeable in its nature, because the creature is not equal to the Creator, and will undergo a change when it shall be cured of every infirmity.

(44) But when the vision "face to face" shall come, that is promised to us, we shall see this Trinity that is not only incorporeal but in the highest degree inseparable and truly unchangeable much more clearly and much more certainly than we now see its image, which we are. But they who see through this mirror and in this enigma, as it is permitted to see in this life, are not they who see those things which we have explained and commended in their mind, but they who look upon their mind as an image, so that they are able, in some way or other, to refer what they see to Him, whose image it is, and also to see by conjecturing that which they now see through the image by beholding, since they cannot yet see face to face. For the Apostle did not say that we now see a mirror, but that "we now see through a mirror" [*1 Corinthians* 13:12].

Chapter 24

Therefore, they who now see their mind, as it can be seen, and that Trinity in it, which I have explained in as many different ways as I could, and yet do not believe or understand it to be an image of God, see a mirror indeed, but see so little of Him through a mirror, who is to be seen now through a mirror, that they do not even know the mirror itself, which they see, to be a mirror, that is, an image. If they did know this and did cleanse their hearts by an unfeigned faith [cf. *1 Timothy* 1:5], then they would perhaps perceive that He, of whom their mind is this mirror, is to be sought through this, and in the meantime seen through this in whatever way He can be seen, so that He who is now seen through a mirror may be able to be seen face to face.

But if they despise the faith that cleanses the hearts, what do they accomplish by understanding what is most subtly discussed about the

nature of the human mind, except that they are even condemned by the testimony of their own understanding? Certainly, they would not labor under such difficulties in understanding this, and scarcely arrive at anything certain, unless they were enveloped in a penal darkness, and burdened with a corruptible body that presses down the soul [cf. *Wisdom* 9:15]. And for what reason, pray, has this evil been deservedly inflicted upon them, if not for sin? Wherefore, they who have been warned by the magnitude of so great an evil ought to follow the Lamb who takes away the sin of the world [cf. *John* 1:29].

Chapter 25

When they who belong to the Lamb, even though far slower of comprehension than those others, are released from the body at the end of this life, the envious powers have no right to retain them. That Lamb, who without any debt of sin was slain by these powers, has overcome them, but not by the might of His power until He had first done so by the justice of His blood. Freed, therefore, from the power of the devil, they are received by the holy angels, and are liberated from all evils through the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus [*1 Timothy* 2:5]. For the Divine Scriptures, both the Old and the New, namely, those in which He was announced beforehand, and those in which He was announced, testify with one voice: “There is no other name under heaven by which men must be saved” [*Acts* 4:12]. But when cleansed from every contagion of corruption, they are placed on peaceful seats until they again receive their own bodies, which will then be incorruptible and will adorn and not burden them. For so it has pleased the best and the most wise Creator that, when the spirit of man has been piously subjected to God, it shall have a body that is happily subject to it, and that this happiness shall remain forever.

(45) We shall see the truth there without any difficulty, and shall enjoy it to the full because it is most clear and most certain. Nor shall we seek anything by the reasoning of the mind, but by contemplating[13] we shall perceive why the Holy Spirit is not the Son when He proceeds from the Father. In that light there shall no longer be any question, but here below it appeared to me from experience itself to be so difficult – and

[13] *contemplante*. Here Augustine expresses the Platonic idea that the highest form of cognition is rational intuition, rather than discursive reasoning.

I do not doubt that it shall also appear so to those who read these writings carefully and intelligently – that as often as I wished to show something similar to that thing in that creature which we are, according to a promise made in the second book of this work to speak of it in another place,[14] my words inadequately expressed the ideas, be they what they were, that I had formed about it in my mind, although even in my actual understanding of it I felt that I had made an attempt more than I had achieved success. And in the one person indeed who is man, I found an image of that highest Trinity, and I wanted to show, especially in the ninth book, how it might be possible to understand those three Persons more easily, even by means of something subject to time and change. But, as we have pointed out in this fifteenth book, the three things belonging to one person could not, as man's purpose required, be fitted to those three Persons.

Chapter 26

There are, furthermore, no intervals of time in that highest Trinity, which God is, that would enable us to show, or at least to inquire, whether the Son was first born of the Father, and the Holy Spirit afterwards proceeded from both, since the Sacred Scripture calls Him the Spirit of both. For it is He of whom the Apostle says: "Because you are Sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts" [*Galatians* 4:6]. And it is He of whom the same Son says: "For it is not you who are speaking, but the Spirit of your Father who speaks in you" [cf. *Matthew* 10:20]. And it is proved by many other testimonies of the divine words that He is the Spirit of both the Father and the Son, who is specially called the Holy Spirit in the Trinity. The Son Himself likewise says of Him: "whom I will send you from the Father" [*John* 15:26], and in another place: "whom the Father will send in my name" [*John* 14:26]. But it so taught that He proceeds from both, because the Son Himself says: "He proceeds from the Father" [*John* 15:26]. And when He had risen from the dead and appeared to His disciples, He breathed upon them and said: "Receive the Holy Spirit" [*John* 20:20], in order to show that He also proceeded from Himself. And this is the power "which went forth from him and healed all" [*Luke* 6:19], as we read in the Gospel.

(46) As to the reason why He first gave the Holy Spirit on earth after His Resurrection, and later sent Him from heaven, it is, I think, because

14 DT 2.3.5.

charity is poured forth in our hearts through the Lord Himself, by which we love both God and our neighbor, according to the two commandments upon which the whole Law and the Prophets depend [cf. *Matthew* 22:40]. To signify this the Lord Jesus twice gave the Holy Spirit, once on earth on account of the love of our neighbor, and again from heaven on account of the love of God. And if perhaps another reason may be advanced why the Holy Spirit was given twice, yet we ought not to doubt that the same Holy Spirit was given when Jesus had breathed upon them of whom He later said: "Go, baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" [cf. *Matthew* 28:19], a passage in which the Trinity is especially commended. And, therefore, it is He who was also given from heaven at Pentecost, that is, ten days after the Lord ascended to heaven.

How, then, is He not God who gives the Holy Spirit? Nay rather, how great a God is He who gives God? For none of His disciples gave the Holy Spirit. They indeed prayed that He might come into them upon whom they laid hands, but they themselves did not give Him. And the Church observes this custom even now in regard to its leaders. Finally, even when Simon the magician offered money to the Apostles, he did not say: "Give me also this power so that I may give the Holy Spirit," but "so that anyone," he said, "upon whom I shall lay my hands may receive the Holy Spirit." For the Scripture had not previously said that Simon saw the Apostles giving the Holy Spirit, but: "Simon seeing that the Holy Spirit was given through the laying on of the Apostles' hands" [cf. *Acts* 8:18–19].

Therefore, our Lord Jesus Himself, too, has not only given the Holy Spirit as God, but has also received Him as man, and for this reason He was said to be full of grace and the Holy Spirit [cf. *Luke* 4:1]. As it was written more plainly of Him in the Acts of the Apostles: "since God anointed him with the Holy Spirit" [cf. *Acts* 10:38]. Certainly this was not done with any visible oil, but with the gift of grace which is signified by the visible anointing whereby the Church anoints the baptized. Nor indeed was Christ then anointed at His Baptism, when the Holy Spirit descended upon Him as a dove [cf. *Matthew* 3:16], for He then deigned to foreshadow His Body, namely, His Church, in which those who are baptized receive the Holy Spirit in a special manner; but We are to understand that He was then anointed by that mystical and invisible anointing when the Word of God was made flesh, that is, when the human nature, without any

preceding merits of good works, was joined together to God the Word in the womb of the Virgin, so as to become one person with Him. For this reason we confess that He was born of the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary.

It is very foolish of us to believe that He received the Holy Spirit when He was already thirty years old (the age at which He was baptized by John the Baptist [cf. *Luke* 3:21–23]); but we believe that as He came to the Baptism without any sin at all, so He was not without the Holy Spirit. For if it was written of His relative and precursor, John himself: "He shall be filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb" [*Luke* 1:15], because he, although begotten through the semination of a father, yet received the Holy Spirit when he was formed in the womb, what are we to understand or to believe of the man-Christ, whose conception in the flesh itself was not carnal but spiritual? And in what was also written of Him that He received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father, and that He poured forth this Spirit [cf. *Acts* 2:33], His two-fold nature was revealed, that is, human and divine, for He received as man, but He pours forth as God. We, on the contrary, can indeed receive this gift in proportion to our own small measure, yet we are utterly unable to pour it forth upon others; but that this may take place, we call down God upon them, by whom this is brought about.

(47) Where time does not exist, can we, therefore, ask whether the Holy Spirit had already proceeded from the Father when the Son was born, or whether He had not yet proceeded, and whether He proceeded from both after the Son was born, just as we could ask, where time is found, whether the will first proceeds from the human mind, in order to seek that which when found is called an offspring; and when that offspring has been born or begotten, whether that will is perfected, resting in it as an end, so that what had been its desire in seeking, now becomes its love in enjoying; and whether that love now proceeds from both, namely, from the mind that begets and from the knowledge that is begotten, as it were, from a parent and its offspring? Such questions cannot be proposed there, where nothing begins from time, in order that it may be perfected at a later time.

Wherefore, he who can understand the birth of the Son from the Father apart from time, let him understand the procession of the Holy Spirit from both apart from time. And he who can understand in that which the Son says: "As the Father has life in himself, so he has given to the Son to have

life in himself" [cf. *John* 5:26] that the Father did not give life to the Son already existing without life, but so begot Him apart from time that the life which the Father gave to the Son by begetting is co-eternal with the life of the Father who gave; let him understand that, just as the Father has in Himself that the Holy Spirit should proceed from Him, so He has given to the Son that the same Holy Spirit should proceed from Him, and both apart from time; and that when the Holy Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, it is to be so understood that His proceeding also from the Son comes to the Son from the Father. For if whatever He has, the Son has from the Father, then certainly He has from the Father that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from Him. But we should not think of this in terms of time, which consists of before and after, because time does not exist there at all.

How, then, would He not be most absurdly called the Son of both, since as the generation from the Father without a beginning in time and without any changeableness in nature bestows essence upon the Son, so the procession of the Holy Spirit from both without any beginning in time, and without any changeableness in nature bestows essence upon the Holy Spirit? For this reason, although we do not say that the Holy Spirit was begotten, yet we do not venture to call Him unbegotten, lest someone might surmise from this word, either that there are two fathers in that Trinity, or that there are two who are not from another. For the Father alone is not from another and, therefore, He alone is called unbegotten, not indeed in the Scriptures, but according to the practice of the disputants who employ such terms as they can about so great a subject. But the Son was born of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds principally from the Father, and since the Father gives without any interval of time, He proceeds from both in common. But He would be called the son of the Father and the Son if, what is abhorrent to everyone of sound mind, both had begotten Him. Therefore, the Spirit of both was not begotten from both, but proceeds from both.

Chapter 27

(48) Because it is most difficult to distinguish the generation from the procession in that co-eternal, incorporeal, and ineffably unchangeable and inseparable Trinity, may our words on this subject, which we delivered in a sermon to the Christian people and afterwards transcribed, suffice

in the meantime for those whose range of knowledge cannot be extended any further.

For among other things, when I had taught from the testimonies of the Sacred Scriptures that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, I said: "If, then, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, why did the Son say: 'He proceeds from the Father'?" [*1 John* 15:26] Why, do you think, except that He usually referred even what was His to Him, from whom He Himself also is? And for this reason He also says: "My teaching is not my own, but his who sent me" [*2 John* 7:16]. If, therefore, His teaching is understood here, and yet He did not call it His own but His Father's, with how much greater reason ought we to understand that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from Him in that place where He so says: "He proceeds from the Father," as to avoid saying: "He does not proceed from me." But He, from whom the Son has that He is God (for He is God of God), from Him He certainly has that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from Him, and, therefore, the Holy Spirit has from the Father Himself, that He also proceeds from the Son, just as He proceeds from the Father.

"Here in some manner that is also understood, insofar as it can be understood by such as we are, why the Holy Spirit is not said to be born, but rather to proceed, since if He Himself were also called the son, He would certainly be called the son of both, which is most absurd. For no one is a son of two, except of a father and mother. But far be it from us to suppose anything of the sort between God the Father and God the Son. For not even a human son proceeds from the father and the mother at the same time; but when he proceeds from the father into the mother, then he does not proceed from the mother; and when he proceeds from the mother into this light, then he does not proceed from the father. But the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father into the Son, and proceed from the Son for the sanctification of the creature; but He proceeds from both at the same time, although the Father has given this to the Son, that just as the Holy Spirit proceeds from Himself, so He also proceeds from Him. For we cannot say that the Holy Spirit is not life, since the Father is life, and the Son is life, and, therefore, just as the Father, since He has life in Himself, has given to the Son also to have life in Himself, so He has also given to Him that life proceeds from Him, just as it proceeds from Himself."[15] I have transferred these words from that

[15] Augustine, *In Joannis Evangelium* 99.8–9.

sermon to the present book, but there I was speaking to the faithful, not to unbelievers.

(49) If they are not capable of beholding this image, and of seeing how true those things are which are in their mind, and that they are not three in such a way as to be three persons, but all three belong to a man who is one person, why do they not believe what is found in the sacred writings about that highest Trinity which God is, rather than insist that a most lucid explanation be given to them, which the dullness and weakness of the human mind cannot grasp? And since they have indeed an unshakeable faith in the Sacred Scriptures as the most reliable witnesses, let them by prayer, study, and a good life seek to understand, that is, that what is retained by faith may be seen *in* the mind, insofar as it can be seen. Who would forbid this? Nay rather, who would not exhort them to do this?

But if they think, therefore, that these things ought to be denied, because they are unable to perceive them with their blind minds, then they who have been blind from their birth ought also to deny that there is a sun. This light, therefore, shines in the darkness, and if the darkness does not grasp it, let them first be illuminated by the gift of God that they may be faithful and begin to be light in comparison with the infidels; and when this foundation has been laid, then let them be built up to see what they believe, so that they may be one day able to see. For some things are so believed that they can no longer be seen at all. For Christ is not to be seen a second time on the cross, but unless one believes that this once took place, and was seen, and so no longer expects that it will take place and be seen again, he does not arrive at Christ, such as He is to be seen forever.

With regard, however, to that supreme, ineffable, incorporeal, and unchangeable nature, which is to be seen in some manner by our understanding, nowhere else does the eye of the human mind exercise itself to better advantage, provided only that it is guided by the rule of faith, than in that which man himself has in his own nature better than other animals, better even than other parts of his own soul, and that is the mind itself; to it a certain insight into invisible things has been granted, and to it, as to one presiding honorably in a higher and more inward place, the senses of the body also announce all things, in order that it may pass judgment upon them; and there is no one above it except God, to whom it is to be made subject, and by whom it is to be ruled.

(50) I venture to acknowledge openly that I have said nothing worthy of the ineffability of that highest Trinity, among all these many things

that I have already said, but confess rather that its sublime knowledge has been too great for me, and that I am unable to reach to it [cf. *Psalm* 139:5]. And you, O my soul, where do you feel yourself to be, where do you lie down, where do you stand, until all your diseases have been healed by Him [cf. *Psalm* 103:3] who is merciful to all your faults? You recognize indeed that you are in that inn to which that Samaritan brought him whom he found half-dead from the wounds inflicted by many robbers [cf. *Luke* 10:30–34]. And yet you have seen many true things, not with these eyes by which colored bodies are seen, but with those for which he prayed who said "Let my eyes see the thing that is right" [cf. *Psalm* 17:2]. Verily, then, you have seen many true things, and you distinguished them by that light which shone upon you when you saw them; raise your eyes to that light itself and fix them upon it, if you can. For in this way you will see in what the birth of the Word of God differs from the procession of the Gift of God; wherefore, the only-begotten Son did not say that the Holy Spirit was begotten by the Father – for in such a case He would be His brother – but that He proceeds from the Father. Therefore, since the Spirit of both is a certain consubstantial union between the Father and the Son, He is not called, far be it from us, the son of both. It is impossible, however, to fix your gaze upon this, so as to behold it clearly and distinctly. I know you cannot. But I speak the truth, I say to myself, I know what I cannot do. Yet this very light reveals to you those three things in you, and in them you recognize the image of that highest Trinity itself, which you are as yet unable to contemplate with your eyes fixed steadily upon it. It also reveals to you that there is a true word in you when it is begotten from your knowledge, that is, when we say what we know; that, although we do not utter or even think of this word as a sound, that is significant in the language of any people, yet our thought is formed from that which we know; and that there is in the gaze of the thinker an image of the thought very similar to that which the memory contained, namely, by the will or love as a third joining these two together, as it were, the parent and the offspring. And he, who is able, sees and discerns that the will indeed proceeds from thought (for no one wills anything of which he is wholly ignorant as to what it is, or of what kind it is), but yet that it is not an image of thought; and that, accordingly, a certain difference is insinuated in this intelligible thing between the birth and the procession, since to see something in thought is not the same as to desire it, or even to enjoy it with the will. You could have also done so, although you neither were able,

nor are you now able, to unfold with adequate speech what you scarcely saw amid the clouds of corporeal likenesses that do not cease to appear in our human thoughts.

But that light, which is not what you are, also shows this to you, that these incorporeal likenesses of bodies are one thing, and that the truth which you behold when these likenesses are set aside in another thing; that light revealed to your interior eyes these and other things that are likewise certain. What is the reason, then, why you are unable to see it with a steady gaze, except indeed your own weakness? And what has brought this upon you except sin? Who, therefore, heals all your diseases, except He who is merciful to all your sins? For this reason I shall now at long last bring this book to a close better by a prayer than by a discussion.

Chapter 28

(51) O Lord, our God, we believe in You, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. For the Truth would not say: "Go, baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" [cf. *Matthew* 28:19] unless you were a Trinity. Nor would You command us, O Lord God, to be baptized in the name of Him who is not the Lord God. Nor would it be said by the divine voice: "Hear, O Israel! The Lord your God is one God" [cf. *Deuteronomy* 6:4] unless you were such a Trinity as to be the one Lord God. And if You Yourself were God the Father, as well as the Son, Your Word Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, Your Gift, we would not read in the Books of Truth: "God sent his Son" [cf. *Galatians* 4:4 and *John* 3:17], nor would You, O Only-Begotten, say of the Holy Spirit: "Whom the Father will send in my name" [*John* 14:26] and "whom I will send you from the Father" [*John* 15:26].

Directing my course according to this rule of faith, insofar as I could, and insofar as You made it possible for me, I sought You, and desired to see with my understanding that which I believed, and I have argued and labored much. O Lord, my God, my only hope, hear me, lest through weariness I should not wish to seek You, but may ardently seek Your face evermore [cf. *Psalm* 105:4]. Give me the strength to seek, You who have caused me to find You, and have given me the hope of finding You more and more. Before You are my strength and my weakness; preserve the one, heal the other. Before You are my knowledge and my ignorance: where You have opened to me, receive me when I enter; where You have

closed, open to me when I knock. May I remember You, understand You, and love You. Increase these gifts in me, until You have reformed me completely.

I know that it is written, "In the multitude of words you shall not avoid sin" [cf. *Proverbs* 10:19]. But would that I were to speak only by preaching Your word and by praising You! Not only would I avoid sin, but I would obtain a good reward, no matter how many words I spoke in this way. For that man, blessed by You, would not command a sin to his own true son in the faith, to whom he wrote, "Preach the word, be urgent in season, out of season" [*2 Timothy* 4:2]. For are we to say that that man did not speak many words, who not only in season but also out of season did not keep silent, O Lord, respecting Your word? But they were not many, therefore, because they were only what were necessary.

Deliver me, O God, from the multitude of words with which I am inwardly afflicted in my soul; it is wretched in Your sight, and takes refuge in Your mercy. For I am not silent in my thoughts, even when I am silent in my words. And if, in truth, I thought only of that which pleased You, I would not, of course, ask You to deliver me from this multitude of words. But many are my thoughts, such as You know; they are the thoughts of men, since they are vain [cf. *Psalm* 94:11]. Grant me, that I may not consent to them, and if at any time they delight me, grant that I may nevertheless reject them, and may not, as though slumbering, dwell upon them. Nor may they ever acquire such power over me that anything may proceed from them into my works; but under Your protection, may at least my opinion and my conscience be safe from them. A certain wise man, when he spoke of You in his book which is now called by the special name "Ecclesiasticus," declared: "We say many things, and fall short, and the sum of our words is, 'He is all'" [cf. *Ecclesiasticus* 43:29]. But when we shall come to You, these "many things" which we say "and fall short" shall cease; and You as One shall remain, You who are all in all [cf. *1 Corinthians* 15:28]; and without ceasing we shall say one thing, praising You in the one, we who have also been made one in You.

O Lord, the One God, God the Trinity, whatever I have said in these books as coming from You, may they acknowledge who are Yours; but if anything as coming from myself, may You and they who are Yours forgive me. Amen.

Index

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Cambridge texts in the history of philosophy

Titles published in the series thus far

Aristotle *Nicomachean Ethics* (edited by Roger Crisp)

Arnauld and Nicole *Logic or the Art of Thinking* (edited by Jill Vance Buroker)

Augustine *On the Trinity* (edited by Gareth B. Matthews)

Bacon *The New Organon* (edited by Lisa Jardine and Michael Silverthorne)

Boyle *A Free Enquiry into the Vulgarly Received Notion of Nature* (edited by Edward B. Davis and Michael Hunter)

Bruno *Cause, Principle and Unity* and *Essays on Magic* (edited by Richard Blackwell and Robert de Lucca with an introduction by Alfonso Ingegno)

Cavendish *Observations upon Experimental Philosophy* (edited by Eileen O'Neill)

Cicero *On Moral Ends* (edited by Julia Annas, translated by Raphael Woolf)

Clarke *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God and Other Writings* (edited by Ezio Vailati)

Condillac *Essay on the Origin of Human Knowledge* (edited by Hans Aarsleff)

Conway *The Principles of the Most Ancient and Modern Philosophy* (edited by Allison P. Coudert and Taylor Corse)

Cudworth *A Treatise Concerning Eternal and Immutable Morality* with *A Treatise of Freewill* (edited by Sarah Hutton)

Descartes *Meditations on First Philosophy,* with selections from the *Objections and Replies* (edited by John Cottingham)

Descartes *The World and Other Writings* (edited by Stephen Gaukroger)

Fichte *Foundations of Natural Right* (edited by Frederick Neuhouser, translated by Michael Baur)

Herder *Philosophical Writings* (edited by Michael Forster)

Hobbes and Bramhall on Liberty and Necessity (edited by Vere Chappell)

Humboldt *On Language* (edited by Michael Losonsky, translated by Peter Heath)

Kant *Critique of Practical Reason* (edited by Mary Gregor with an introduction by Andrews Reath)

Kant *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (edited by Mary Gregor with an introduction by Christine M. Korsgaard)

Kant *The Metaphysics of Morals* (edited by Mary Gregor with an introduction by Roger Sullivan)

Kant *Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics* (edited by Gary Hatfield)

Kant *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason and Other Writings* (edited by Allen Wood and George di Giovanni with an introduction by Robert Merrihew Adams)

La Mettrie *Machine Man and Other Writings* (edited by Ann Thomson)

Leibniz *New Essays on Human Understanding* (edited by Peter Remnant and Jonathan Bennett)

Malebranche *Dialogues on Metaphysics and on Religion* (edited by Nicholas Jolley and David Scott)

Malebranche *The Search after Truth* (edited by Thomas M. Lennon and Paul J. Olscamp)

Melanchthon *Orations on Philosophy and Education* (edited by Sachiko Kusukawa, translated by Christine Salazar)

Mendelssohn *Philosophical Writings* (edited by Daniel O. Dahlstrom)

Nietzsche *Beyond Good and Evil* (edited by Rolf-Peter Horstmann and Judith Norman)

Nietzsche *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings* (edited by Raymond Geuss and Ronald Speirs)

Nietzsche *Daybreak* (edited by Maudemarie Clark and Brian Leiter, translated by R. J. Hollingdale)

Nietzsche *The Gay Science* (edited by Bernard Williams, translated by Josefine Nauckhoff)

Nietzsche *Human, All Too Human* (translated by R. J. Hollingdale with an introduction by Richard Schacht)

Nietzsche *Untimely Meditations* (edited by Daniel Breazeale, translated by R. J. Hollingdale)

Schleiermacher *Hermeneutics and Criticism* (edited by Andrew Bowie)

Schleiermacher *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers* (edited by Richard Crouter)

Schopenhauer *Prize Essay on the Freedom of the Will* (edited by Günter Zöller)

Sextus Empiricus *Outlines of Scepticism* (edited by Julia Annas and Jonathan Barnes)

Shaftesbury *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (edited by Lawrence Klein)

Adam Smith *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (edited by Knud Haakonssen)

Voltaire *Treatise on Tolerance and Other Writings* (edited by Simon Harvey)